

Mr. BLAKES ANSWER,

TO

Mr. TOMBES his LETTER.

IN

Vindication of the BIRTH-PRIVILEGE,  
or Covenant holinesse of Beleevers, and their Issue,  
in the time of the G O S P E L.

Together with

The right of INFANTS to BAPTISME.

1 Cor. 7. 14.

Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy.

*Cornelius à lapide in locum.*

Hinc Calvinus & Beza suum dogma de traducce justitiæ hauserunt, docentque fidelium filios proprie esse sanctos, & sine Baptismo salvari, quia hoc ipso quo fidelium sunt filii, censentur esse in Ecclesia nati, juxta tædus divinum, Ero Deus tuus & seminis tui, Gen. 17. 7. Quemadmodum jure civili censentur liberi, qui ex altero parente libero nascuntur. Sed errant.

Col. 2. 11, 12,

In whom also yee are circumcised, with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ, buried with him in Baptism, &c.

*Peleusiota, Lib. 1. Epist. 125.*

*Judei Baptismi loco circumcisione utebantur.*

*Chamier Panstrat: Cathol. Tom. 4. Lib. 2. Cap. 10. Sect. 58.*

Plurima sunt ejusdem testimonia, ex quibus constat persuasum olim fuisse Christianis, non fuisse admodum diversam circumcisionis rationem & Baptismi. Cur hodie mutatum? Et quidem in Papistarum gratiam & quidem ad arbitrium Jesuitarum.

Aug. 7<sup>th</sup>

L O N D O N,

Printed, by R. L. for Abel Roper, at the signe of the Sun  
against St. Dunstons Church in Fleetstreet, 1646.





*Courteous Reader,*

**A**S we doubt not to affirm, that the learned assertors of the warrantableness of *Pædobaptisme*, have not lost an inch of ground by the opposition of such as are upon the Negative: So we are confident, that the ventilation of the point, hath brought forth a cleerer light, and given thee more assurance of, and establishment in, the truth. The question is concerning the right of Infants to Baptism, and concerning the practice of the Churches of Christ in all ages in baptizing them. The former (which is indeed *omne punctum*) is carried strongly by Scripture arguments. If legitimate consequence can make an apodictical evidence The latter (as being matter of fact) by such undeniable testimonies of credible witnesses, that he that doth not see it may well be called (as that *Walafrius* was, who is cited in this point.) *Strabo, a vitio oculorum*. The<sup>a Bellar. d</sup> authour of this vindication being dispo-<sup>Scrip. Eccle</sup>sed of by the providence of God at a great di-<sup>ad annu, 84</sup>stance of place from *London*, doth now come up in the *Rere*, who was in the *Forefront*, in that judici

treatise called, *The Birth-priviledge*, where thou shalt find the question so truly stated & set upon the right *Basis*, & so well fortified, that though there hath bin a dust raised, (by some who have a better faculty to raffle & intricate an argument than to winde it off) yet there is not the least wing of it routed. The Reverend Divine to whom this Answer is directed, did enter the lists, principally against *Mr. Marshall* (for he that intends to value himself by his Antagonist, will challenge none but *Cæsar*) and it is true, he came forth like *Achilles*, but fights like *Ajax*, had he met with such milk-sop arguments, as had bin *lifflanda supercilio*, or *cothurno dissipanda*, he had cleared the field, but now there remains to him no triumph, except like that of *Caligula*, which was for the gathering of cockleshells. Read (after others) this Answer, which needs no Ivy bush-Epistle, it is finewy for argument, & in expression or language modest, and then make a faithfull report, to thy own judgment of the result of all, and we doubt not of thy concurrence with

Thine in the Lord Iesus Christ,  
Edm. Calamy. Richard Vines.

## The Contents of this Treatise.

- Chap. 1. **T**He Preface by way of addresse to Master Tombes, pag. 1.
- Chap. 2. § 1. Seven Queries propounded to Mr. Tombes, concerning the practice of antiquity about infant-baptisme. p. 3.
- § 2 Four observations concerning the practice of antiquity about the time of baptisme, p. 8.
- Chap. 3. § 1 Mr. Tombes his complaint of his adversaries justly layd to his own charge by way of retortion, p. 10.
- § 2 The salvation of dying infants cannot by any Scripture grounds be asserted, by those that confesse originall sin; and deny them right to baptisme, p. 12.
- Chap. 4. The text Gal. 3. 29. vindicated, and the distinction of births, as once applyed to Abrahams seed, from thence asserted, p. 18.
- Chap. 5. What that expression means, children are taken in to covenant with their parents, p. 22.
- Chap. 6. The text, Rom. 11. 16. vindicated, and a covenant holinesse from thence asserted, p. 29.
- Chap. 7. The text, 1 Cor. 7. 14. vindicated and explained,
- § 1 The Corinthians had their scruple concerning infants born of one believing and another unbelieving parent, whether they were to be accounted unclean or holy, p. 31.
- § 2 The unbelieving party is instrumentally sanctified in the procreation of issue, the believing party doth sanctifie, p. 34.
- Chap. 8. The texts, Exod. 19. 6. 1 Pet. 2. 9. both understood of and applyed to the Church visible, as professing themselves members of Christ, when the true members of Christ are only worthy of that honour, p. 45.
- Chap. 9. There is no more expresse precedent in Scripture for womens receiving the Sacrament of the Lords Supper then for infant-baptisme, p. 51.
- Chap. 10. The doctrine of covenant holinesse derived from parents to children more ancient then the days of Zuinglius, being taught as by Peter, Paul, so also by Tertullian, Hierome, &c. the Jesuits were the first, and are the chief opposers, p. 55.
- Chap. 11. § 1 Concerning the Grammaticall construction of those words, Go and teach all Nations baptizing them, p. 62.
- § 2 What infants are of right to be baptized, Pedobaptists have a rule to discern it. Antipedobaptists can finde no rule correspondent to their principles for baptisme of grown persons, p. 65.



§ 3 Concerning some Propositions charged by way of Suppositions on Master Marshall and the Author. p. 71.

§ 4 A digression concerning Arguments drawn from analogie or parity of reason, as well in positive as in all commandments. p. 73.

§ 5 Infants of believing parents, whether and in what sense they are Discip'le, p. 80.

§ 6 A vindication of that text. Esay 49. 22. being a prophesie, not directly of infant-baptisme, but of the acceſſe of the Gentiles to the Church of Christ. p. 82.

Chap. 12. Concerning the baptisme of whole households; men, men in Scripture, whether examples to be contemned, p. 84.

Chap. 13. A vindication of that text, Matth. 19. 14. Mark. 10. 14. with answer of six severall exceptions taken against it, and the consequence of infant-baptisme thence demonstrated, p. 86.

Chap. 14. Of the knowledge requisite concerning the persons to be baptized, and that according to Mr. Tombs his grounds, no persons without extraordinary revelation are baptizable, p. 93.

Chap. 15. § 1. The Seals of the Sacrament are conditionall nor absolute, p. 96.

§ 2 The entrance into covenant, and acceptance of the terms of it, is common to the elect and reprobate, a heart stedfast in the covenant, and the merites of the covenant are properly only to the elect, and regenerate, p. 100.

§ 3 To say that the Seals of the Sacraments are conditionall, and that the reprobate are within the verge of the covenant, as tendered in the Gospell, and accepted, is not to symbolize with Arminians, p. 108.

Chap. 17. The comforts of Christian parents in their issue is much eclipsed, when they are cast out of covenant, and their right to the initiating Sacrament of baptisme is denied, p. 110.

Chap. 18. The conclusion of the whole, p. 111.

---

Gentle Reader, you are desired to correct some few mistakes in the Printing, as Page 2 last line but one, add for the Reverend Chairman, p. 71. L. 14. add of God when the Covenant p. 96. l. 10. for conditionall, conditionall, with such others as thou meet withall in the reading.



FOR  
The Reverend and Learned, M.  
John Tombes : B. of D.

CHAP. I.

The Preface by way of addresse to Mr. Tombes.

SIR.

**H**He good providence of God hath sett me at a great distance in place from you, and you have given to the world large evidence, that you are yet further removed in affection from me : Your examen of Mr. Marshalls Sermon is come to my hands, in which how much of a brother, a freind, an ancient acquaintance, I may find, I leave it to your selfe, upon second, and more serious thoughts to consider ; those that know us both, I doubt not, will observe. I continued your neighbour in London, the space of full 16 Moneths, after that small peice (which you trample so much upon) was published ; in which time we had frequent occasions of converse together, when also occasionally you professed your love to be to me as much as ever. In all which time, I appeale to your selfe, whether you once opened your mouth, to helpe me out of so grosse an errour, and those many great mistakes, into the which you tell the world that I am plunged : You have made it indeed appeare, how low I stand in your thoughts ; yet sure Fought

## The Preface by way of adresse

not to be set so low, as to stand beneath your charity. You owe that Duty to your enemies straying beast, much more to your erring brother, especially seeing it is an error (if an error) from which your selfe is but of late delivered, and in which almost the whole world of Christians yet continues. And much more were you obliged, in that I was not wanting in the like office (with severall others of our brethren in the Ministry in London) to have given you satisfaction, when in a more modest way, you then did only professe some scruples, and earnestly seemed to desire it, which endeavour of ours, how it was by you recompensed, and how satisfying your present answers then were to severall arguments from the mouths of many disputants I would appeal to the learned auditory then present, but that I know they are with you in like esteeme, with any others whom your treatise mentions; when we saw our expectations frustrate, and our reasons with you of no force, we earnestly desired your reasons, on the contrary part; If infant baptisme be unlawfull, why unlawfull? and as you had many dayes taken the place of a respondent, so some should now be appointed to answer your objections, which motion (notwithstanding our importunity) you still refused: Vpon this you went about your exercitation (as you call it) presented to the Chayre man, whom you mention, which might in reason, have been first tendered to those that did desire it, but that it had been too great a condescension. Afterwards Mr. Marshall publishing his Sermon on that subject, you adresse your selfe to him, not so much as once consulting, (as ever I could learne) with any of your brethren, because (as you give the reason pag. 3. He is a leading man, and (pag. 171) the Antesignanus, or Ensigne bearener in this thing; In which choice of yours (passing by all others, even when they offered their paines) how can you avoid those censures, which did freely passe upon you, from many mouths, and which I forbear to mention, I leave to the secrets of your ownne breast, impartially to be examined: whereas you complaine of neglect from them both (though I take upon me to Apologize for neither of their silence, they are fittest to returne answer for them selves, yet) thus much I may say, that Mr. Marshalls employment (well known in more then one Kingdome) may speake for him; I desire to know in what capacity you did expect his answer, as a private Minister it would not have given



your satisfaction, your adresse to him is under another notion. As a charge man it could not be done, but as the act of the whole Committee, his place being only to make report of the result of all their thoughts in which he hath only his single voice, neither could they do it without assent of the whole Assembly from whom they receive their commission, nor could the Assembly (as I humbly conceive) give them any such power without the two Houses of Parliament. And in case they should order all papers (not only of dissenting brethren among themselves but of all others) to be answered, when would there be an end? I may perhaps have my scruples in some other thing, and a thousand more besides me, if your papers were communicated to the Committee, when this businesse pass their hands, that was all in this way you could look for; as for the Chaire mans indeavour, in a more private way to have given you satisfaction, I my self am an eye witnesse of it. As for your letter, being so farr concerned, and severall others for my sake, I owe so much to my selfe, to them, but especially to the truth, that I am resolved not to be wholly silent, so farr as I am engaged, I shall endeavour (God willing) to examine (though I cannot so single out my part, but somewhat more will fall in with it) leaving the rest of the taske to some more able hands, whom I hope, you will not so farr undervalue.

CHAP. II. Sect. I.

Seven queres propounded to Mr. Tombes concerning the practice of antiquity about infant-baptisme.

YOur Letter is divided by your selfe, into foure parts, the first is concerning the antiquity of infant-baptisme, in which the question is not concerning the right, but only the practice, not whether infant-baptisme ought, but whether it hath anciently been used; your worke is, to make it appear to be a novelty, & your adversaries to vindicate it from that charge, & assert the ancient practice of it; concerning which let me mind you, that one hath gone before you, making like challeng of Mr. Marshall with your selfe, and though you are a man of farr other dexterity, to mannage the fight, yet he hath made the same assault (Mr. Black-wood in his *forme of Antichrist*, part 2. Pag. 25) who I suppose hath received a satisfying answer,

## Seven quæres concerning the practice

which the reader may (if he please) peruse. *Infant-baptisme freed from Antichristianisme* pag. 51. I intend not therefore *alium agere*, to do the same worke twice over, yet that I may speake some thing, as to him, so to you also, give me leave to propose some few quæres, and to lay down some generall observations.

I Whether the authorities produced by Pædo-baptists for the antiquity of Infant-Baptisme, or yours for the novelty of it be of greater weight, or more to be credited; you have on your part *Walafridus Strabo*, and *Ludovicus Vives*. *Strabo* lived in the ninth century in the yeare 842. as you say, in the yeare 850. as *Vossius* sayes, one that marris his own tale in telling, having affirmed that in the first times, the grace of Baptisme was wont only to be given to them who by integrity both of body and mind were already come to this that they could know and understand what profits is to be obtained in Baptisme, what is to be confessed, and believed, what lastly is to be observed of them that are borne againe in Christ; he instances in *Austine* whose Baptisme (he says) was delayed till the age 25, making that a time, when Infant-Baptisme was not in use; when by your own confession in the Church the custome was grown so sacred, that none durst oppose it. In the same worke, *De rebus Ecclesiasticis* he sayeth that women among the Jews were circumcised, as by *Alapide* on *Gen. 17* he is cited; in either of which testimonies he is worthy of equall credit, *Vive* lived in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, about 700 years after *Strabo*, a sceptick in all sciences, and finding fault with all persons, and things; *In literis polioribus doctior quam divinarum peritis*, *Saith Iosephus vice-comes*; yet if he had lived a 100 years before *Austine*, as *Austine* 1100 years before him, and if *Austine* had commented upon *Vives*, as *Vives* did upon *Austine*, then his authority had been urged with some colour. One *Tertullian*, one *Cyprian*, one *Austin*, one *Ambrose*, one *Hierom*, though many a one more might be added, would weigh both these down, who with all their reading in antiquity, have no other authority, but their own, had you but one halfe of this advantage, you would soone have insulted.

2 Whether the negative argument which you, with Mr. *Blackwood* draw from the silence of *Ignatius*, *Clement Alexandrinus*, *Athanasius*, *Epiphanius*, *Eusebius*, (if silent) be of equall weight with the universall silence of all the world for 840 years not any one in all this space mentioning any beginning lower then the Apostles times, or passing your censure of novelty upon it, especially being provoked to it, by the frequent assertions of those that derived it from the Apostles themselves, such notorious untruths could never so universally have past without contradiction. It is not necessary that every

every writer should speake of all subiects, but it is necessary that truth should have some defenders: innovations, and foregeries, should find some opposits in all ages.

3 Whereas you make so much use of the silence of *Iustin Martyr* and *Epiphanius*, should not they rather passe with you for the simplest of Pædobaptists seeing they follow the same *ignis fatuus* or foolish fire, which (you say) pag. 94 *hath led Pædobaptists into bogges*. *Epiphanius* (more then once) makes Baptisme the successor of Circumcision, *duravit Circumcisio temporis inserviens donec maior circumcisio accessit, hoc est lavacrum regenerationis*: *Epi. contra Cerinthum*, and againe *Circumcisio carnalis inservit usque ad magnam circumcisionem*, See *Aretius* in problem: loc. 80. Col. 455. Also his answer to the censure of Pædobaptists. *Iustin Martyr* makes circumcision a type of Baptisme, as you may see in the same author; when this principle runs in their heads, as strongly as you conceit pag. 130 it doth in mine, (namely that Baptisme succeeds Circumcision) how can they be kept off from the same conclusions? And it is more then strange that *Epiphanius* his silence should serve for your purpose, when *Gregory Nazianzen* his contemporary (10 yeers according to the computation of some, 20 yeers according to the computation of others his senior) is confessed by your self in the page immediately before) to command children to be baptised, least they should misse of the common grace; &c. whereas you speake somewhat sparingly, not that infantbaptisme was not known, but that it was not universally known in the Greeke-Church in *Epiphanius* his time, can you thinke that *Epiphanius* himselfe was ignorant of it? that he knew not what *Gregory Nazianzen* had wrote and ordered? It is to me an evident argument, that then it universally past without dispute or opposition, seeing he that wrote so largely of Heresies, (a small errour in his dialect passing for an Heresie) yet mentions not Pædobaptisme; had there been any dispute about it, we should have heard his censure, either of the adversaries, or the maintainers of it.

4 When *Tertullian* among other fancies, did dislike the haste in baptizing infants, and unmarried persons, giving his reasons (such as they be) that the delay were more profitable, whether it can be imagined, that he among others, would have kept silence, had he known or suspected it, to have been an innovation; but would have made use of that argument in the first place against it; and consequently, whether he be not an author more ancient then any that you have acknowledged? He complains of present practices (in his thoughts lesse profitable though not sinfull) and doth not prophesy of such that did follow in after ages.

5 Whereas, you say pag. 11. the resolution of *Cyprian* with his Collogues



which the reader may (if he please) peruse. *Infant-baptisme freed from Antichristianisme* pag. 51. I intend not therefore *alium agere*, to do the same worke twice over, yet that I may speake some thing, as to him, so to you also, give me leave to propose some few quæres, and to lay down some generall observations.

I Whether the authorities produced by Pædo-baptists for the antiquity of Infant-Baptisme, or yours for the novelty of it be of greater weight, or more to be credited; you have on your part *Walafridus Strabo*, and *Ludovicus Vives*. *Strabo* lived in the ninth century in the year 840. as you say, in the year 850, as *Vossius* sayes, one that marris his own tale in telling, having affirmed that in the first times, the grace of Baptisme was wont only to be given to them who by integrity both of body and mind were already come to this that they could know and understand what profit is to be obtained in Baptisme, what is to be confessed, and believed, what lastly is to be observed of them that are borne againe in Christ; he instances in *Austine* whose Baptisme (he says) was delayed till the age 25, making that a time, when Infant-Baptisme was not in use; when by your own confession in the Church the custome was grown so sacred, that none durst oppose it. In the same worke, *De rebus Ecclesiasticis* he sayeth that women among the Iews were circumcised, as by *Atapide* on *Gen. 17* he is cited; in either of which testimonies he is worthy of equall credit, *Vive* lived in the 16 century, about 700 years after *Strabo*, a sceptick in all sciences, and finding fault with all persons, and things; *In literis politioribus doctior quam divinarum peritus*, Saith *Iosephus vice-comes*; yet if he had lived a 100 years before *Austine*, as *Austine* 1100 years before him, and if *Austine* had commented upon *Vives*, as *Vives* did upon *Austine*, then his authority had been urged with some colour. One *Tersullian*, one *Cyprian*, one *Austin*, one *Ambrose*, one *Hierom*, though many a one more might be added, would weigh both these down, who with all their reading in antiquity, have no other authority, but their own, had you but one halfe of this advantage, you would soone have insulted.

Whether the negative argument which you, with Mr. *Blackwood* draw from the silence of *Ignatius*, *Clement*, *Alexandrinus*, *Athanasius*, *Epiphanius*, *Ensebius*, (if silent) be of equall weight with the universall silence of all the world for 840 years not any one in all this space mentioning any beginning lower then the Apostles times, or passing your censure of novelty upon it, Especially being provoked to it, by the frequent assertions of those that derived it from the Apostles themselves, such notorious untruths could never so universally have past without contradiction. It is not necessary that

every

every writer should speake of all subiects, but it is necessary that truth should have some defenders: innovations, and foregeries, should find some opposits in all ages.

3 Whereas you make so much use of the silence of *Iustin Martyr* and *Epiphanius*, should not they rather passe with you for the simplest of Pædobaptists seeing they follow the same ignis fatens or foolish fire, which (you say) pag. 94 hath led Pædobaptists into bogges. *Epiphanius* (more then once) makes Baptisme the successor of Circumcision, *duravit Circumcisio tempore inferviens donec maior circumcisio accessit, hoc est lavacrum regenerationis*: *Epi. contra Cerinthum*, and againe *Circumcisio carnalis inferviens usque ad magnam circumcisionem*, See *Aretius* in problem: loc. 80. Col. 455. also his answer to the censure of Pædobaptists. *Iustin Martyr* makes circumcision a type of Baptisme, as you may see in the same author; when this principle runs in their heads, as strongly as you conceit pag. 130 it doth in mine, (namely that Baptisme succeeds Circumcision) how can they be kept off from the same conclusions? And it is more then strange that *Epiphanius* his silence should serve for your purpose, when *Gregory Nazianzen* his contemporary (10 yeers according to the computation of some, 20 yeers according to the computation of others his senior) is confessed by your self (in the page immediately before) to command children to be baptised, least they should misse of the common grace; &c. whereas you speake somewhat sparingly, not that infantbaptisme was not known, but that it was not universally known in the Greeke-Church in *Epiphanius* his time, can you thinke that *Epiphanius* himselfe was ignorant of it? that he knew not what *Gregory Nazianzen* had wrote and ordered? It is to me an evident argument, that then it universally past without dispute or opposition, seeing he that wrote so largely of Heresies, (a small errour in his dialect passing for an Heresie) yet mention's not Pædobaptisme; had there been any dispute about it, we should have heard his censure, either of the adversaries, or the maintainers of it.

4 When *Tertullian* among other fancies, did dislike the haste in baptizing infants, and unmarried persons, giving his reasons (such as they be) that the delay were more profitable, whether it can be imagined, that he among others, would have kept silence, had he known or suspected it, to have been an innovation; but would have made use of that argument in the first place against it; and consequently, whether he be not an author more ancient then any that you have acknowledged? He complains of present practices (in his thoughts lesse profitable though not sinfull) and doth not prophesy of such that did follow in after ages.

5 Whereas, you say pag. 11. the resolution of *Cyprian* with his Collogues

is not so lightly to be passed over, sith the determination of this Council, as far as I can by search find, is the very spring head of Infant-Baptisme, I desire to know, what colour of truth you can put upon those words, seeing you find the practice of it more ancient in the latin Church then Cyprian, and may find, by an easie search in that Epistle of his, to Fidus, that Infant-Baptisme, was not in that Council of Cyprian and his 66 Bishops, so much as agitated, much lesse determined; it was never there put to the question, but of all, that were present, taken for granted; both the dispute and determination was concerning the Baptisme of an Infant before the age of 8 dayes, which only Fidus questioned.

6 Whereasto weakene *Austins* testimony, which is so full against you, you say *Austins* works being greatly esteemed, as being the hammer of the Pelagians, the following refuters of Pelagianisme, *Prosper*, *Fulgentius*, the Cancellarius did condemne it, as those of Carthage, Arles, Milevis, did rest together on *Austins* arguments, and often on his words, and *Austin* in time was accounted one of the fower doctors of the Church, esteemed like the fower Evangelists, so that his opinion was the rule of the Churches Judgement, and the schools determination, as to the great hurt of Gods Church, *Luther* and others have been of late. I desire to know whether this high esteeme of *Austin*, was in matters of Faith, or in matters of Fact? whether, as he was accounted one of the fower Doctors of the Church, so he was also accounted (as I may say) the Recorder and annall-keeper of it? whether as men rested on his words for what was to be beleaved, so also for what in former times had been observed? and whether this high esteeme of his were among the Hereticks and Sectaries, or among the Catholicks & Orthodoxe? whether *Austin* in his own time, or in the ages following, had no adversaries, nor that envied his reputation? we are now upon matter of fact, and not of faith; what was done in his time and what had been before him is that alone, in which his authority is alledged. In which, though some would have it upon ticket, because he said it, yet some would not have been wanting to have questioned it, when *Austin* urged the Churches practice of Baptizing infants from the Apostles time, as a proofe of original sin; it concerned the Pelagians, his adversaries, denying original sin, to examine it, which yet *Austin* says (and you confesse) they never durst deny that custome, yet they were more like to have discovered the untruth of *Austins* assertion in the age, then you in this, at 700 years further distance, the world may well wonder at their timorositie, or your boldnes, their ignorance or your intelligence. The more credit *Austin* had, the more care he should (as it should) be to preserve it. And whereas you parallell *Austins* case and



and Luther, I demand if Luther had vented the most grosse untruth that could be conceived, as that Images had bin in Churches ever since the Apostles times, without contradiction or opposition, whether none would have beene found to this day to have contradicted it: Such a thing you put upon *Austin*; That rule of his hee applies to Infants Baptisme, That which the whole Church holds, and was not ordained by any Councells, but hath ever beene hold, that is rightly believed to bee by Apostolicall Authority, de Baptis- contra Donat. lib. 4. chap. 24. and speaking of this subject of Infants Baptisme, let no man saith hee suggest other doctrine, the Church ever hath had this, ever hath hold it, this it hath received from the faith of our Predecessors, and in this, will to the end persevere de verbis Apostoli. Ser. 10. Farther he saith, The custome of the Church in the Baptisme of Infants is by no means to be despised, or to be accounted superfluous, nor yet altogether to be credited but that it is a tradition of the Apostles, *Ad Valentinum in Epist. 3.* what may be thought of him, if Infant Baptisme were (as you pretend) an innovation?

7. Whether those errors, by you reckoned up, as your conjecturall grounds of Infants Baptisme, viz. The taking away of originall sinne, the conferring of the grace of Regeneration, &c. may not with farre more probability be coneluded to have beene the grounds [not of hastning but] of the delay of it? You know, that this Sacrament was esteemed the first plank after shipwracke, and that by application of the blood of Christ, all finnes past, originall and actual, were done away by it: Who would not then put this off, as nigh to the houre of death as possible, to have all sinne, *ipso facto*, by that water cleansed, and the account so easily past? This appeares to mee of greater probability then your conjecture, for these reasons.

1. From the words of *Tertullian*, where hee speaks for the delay of Baptisme (as in Infants so in unmarried persons) *Quid festinas innocens ad remissionem peccatorum?* *Tertul. lib. de bapt. cap. decimo octavo*, Why should that innocent age make such haste to the remission of sins? he thought (as it seems) that it were more prudence, to stay till a greater heape of sinne was gathered, that so at once all might be cleansed, and therefore, for the same reason, he would not have unmarried persons baptised, but to stay till there lust was extinguished.

2. Because that in those times, when Baptisme was put off by some till time of growth, yet (by your owne confession) in case of danger, they were Baptized, which makes it appeare, that they did not think Infants no subject of Baptisme, but had other reasons for the delay of it.

3 In that upon death approaching, at what age soever, they hastened it, as you observe pag. 14 in *Austins* Baptisme being young, and falling sicke he desired, and his mother thought to have him Baptized, but upon his recovery, it was deferred.

4 In that they did not use to Baptize, as soon as they were of understanding, and able to make profession, but delayed it many yeers, as appears in *Austin*, *Valentinian* the Emperor, and divers others, so that were your desire obtained, to Baptize as soone as profession can be made, respectively to those examples that you cull out, it were no other but an innovation. All these things considered (which out of antiquity you have observed, and what in my slender reading I have gathered,) I observe in the first 840 yeers.

*Seet. II. Foure observations concerning the practice of antiquity about the time of Baptisme.*

**T**Hat as nothing is directly prescribed in the scriptures for the time of Baptisme, in what yeere, moneth or day it ought to be observed, but according to the manner of the New Testament, in like circumstances, left without precise determination, so in any time of mens age, it was agreed to be lawfull: I do not reade of any man, in all this time, that can be named, that, in any time of a mans age, iudged it unlawfull; you tell us indeed of a canon of the synod of Neocæsaria, in the yeere 350, that determines, that a woman with child may be Baptized, because the Baptisme reached not to the fruit of her wombe. If that synod were carefull to avoid Baptisme of Infants in the wombe, it is strange that neither that synod, nor yet any other, did ordaine any canon, to forbid the Baptisme of them being borne, nor that any writer in that age should follow the sentence of that synod, or so much as vouchsafe a quotation of it, I vehemently suspect that canon, seeing I cannot but suspect the affection of that antiquary (who raked it out of the ashes for you) not only to the Baptisme of infants, but to the ordinance of Baptisme it selfe, seeing (that notwithstanding his learned worke *De satisfactione Christi*) he is become a follower of that author (namely *Faustus Socinus*) whose opinion is, that the water of Baptisme hath no precept of Christ, or at least no perpetuall and universall precept, and on the words of the institution *Matt. 28. 19.* he hath his glosse to avoid it; and though it should be granted, that Christs words are meant of Baptisme of water, yet that did belong (as he sayes) to the Churches first beginning, when rude people accustomed to ceremonies were brought to Christ,

Christ, where you may finde that Objection, as an argument *ad rem*, which Master Marshall, and Master Cooke bring only *ad hominem*, which also (as I remember) you say you never read but in Master Marshall, that there is no example in all the Scripture of the Baptisme of any that was borne of Christian Parents: So that this Synod notwithstanding, I willingly subscribe to that which you quote out of Grotius, that in Tertullians time (I adde the time before him, and some space of time after him,) there was nothing defined, concerning the age in which they were to bee baptized, that were consecrated by their Parents to Christian discipline.

2. No beginning lower then the Apostles times, can bee found of the practise of Infant Baptisme; many have affirmed, that it began then; no one ever appeared (no not they that were most concern'd) to contradict it. This I observe not only because I never read of any, but because Master Blackwood and your selfe (who deale freely enough with Master Marshall, as though he made no more conscience of over lashing (as you speak) then Origen, Austin, or Hierom who affirme the same thing with them) have produced none (and therefore I believe cannot) that deny the practise of it.

3. They having generally (as hath been said) an over high opinion of the worke it selfe in Baptisme, to take away sinne, what time soever they thought most behoofesfull to have all past sinnes, originall and actuall cleansed, that time they thought most opportune and seasonable for the administration of it; this opinion of Baptisme-efficacy standing, this other necessarily followes; but what this time was, when the cleansing of sinne might be of most use, was not agreed upon by all, but that it must be so done, that death did not prevent it; on all hands it was concluded, and as neere to the time of death as might be (it seemes) sometimes it was protracted.

4. The time now set by the opposers of Infant Baptisme, to be as soon as they are able to give account of their faith, was not by them at all observed, as may bee seen in that instance of yours in Austin; as also in the words of Tertullian who thought it of use, not onely to defer Baptisme of Infants, till yeares of discretion, but the Baptisme of all unmarried persons, till lust were extinguished, so that your tenent may well passe for an innovation, when ours hath sufficient warrant in antiquity; but those that looke at another use of Baptisme, an initiating Sacrament into the Church, and know that Infants by Christs testimony, are of the Church, Mar. 10. honoured by him with a Church priviledge, (Numb. 6 & Mar. 10. compared.) and that Baptisme (not by analogy but institution) is a



signe and Seale of the Covenant, and infants (though you would deny it) to bee within Covenant, have justly concluded the time of infancy to bee most expedient, and accordingly practiced, as the lawfulness in antiquity was never questioned.

### CHAP. III. Sect. I.

*Master Tombes his complaints of his adversaries, justly layd to his own charge by way of retortion.*

**Y**Our second part is concerning the prejudices against Antipedo-Baptists, from their miscarriages. Where in your first entrance, you minde Mr. Marshall of an Order of the *Areopagites*, mentioned by *Sme Symnus*, that in pleading causes before them, Prefaces should bee avoyded as tending to create prejudices in the Iudges, and then you complaine of such practises in Master Marshall, the Author of the *Frontispice to Doctor Featlies Booke*, Master Edwards, the *History of the Anabaptists*, The Anabaptist Catechism, as also in veltives used in sermons every where to make Anabaptists odious, which (you say) are but artifices, serving only to prevent impartial discussing of things: but, I pray you, tell me for my learning (for I know no more of this order, then that which I have from you, and the author that you cite) did those grave severe Iudges forbid these artifices in Oratours prefaces, and allow of them through the whole texture of their speeches, and in their closures, which you seeme to intimate, in that you tell Mr. Marshall, that had his narration, to beget an odium, hatred, or preiudice, at least in his auditors, come after other arguments, it might have been more excusable, in which as you seeme not point blanke to vary from your own rule, so you do not keepe constant to it; your beginning with Mr. Marshall is much like the close of a seasonable march, in our English proverbe, meeke as a lambe, but not only your close, but proceedings on are rough, like a lion; how seldome can I meeete with any answer of yours to any words of mine without some bitter censure (such as is seldome scene in moderate writers) by way of preface premised? How deserving Mr. Marshall and others are of this censure of yours I will not here contend; they are able to speake for themselves; only, I say, that you are the unfittest of men to passe it against them: there is not an adversary or freind of your adversaries, that can escape your lash: Mr. Woodcocke cannot commend a treatise of Mr. Cookes, but a censure must passe on him for it; once will not serve, but as soon as one is over,

• he must have a second wipe: yea the whole Assembly covertly for his sake pag. 79. and mentioning an interpretation of Mr. *Cook*, against which you have little to say, it must be with this Elogie, *ὁ σοφὸς ἐπαυανὸν αὐτὸν ἰσχυρὸν ἄνθρωπον* a wise remedy, page 140. and the selfe same you have for Master *Marshall* page 81. and S. C. having printed a book called a plea for Infants Baptisme, must not only have it brand (which in some passages it doth deserve) but all the Ministers of *Christ*, that ever held the Baptisme of Infants, must bee branded with him; mentioning some passages in that book, pag. 144. you adde, these I mention, that you may see what stuffe *Pedobaptists* do feede the people with. How long is it (good Sir) since your selfe was not ashamed to owne that name? what stuffe was it, that the people in *Worcester*, *Lampeter*, and for some time in *Bristol* had from your mouth? I have both heard, and heard of savory food from you, while a *Pedobaptist*, and have seene you, with great diligence, frequent the Sermons of such men; what stuffe you found, I know not; others grow by it, and blesse God for it; and a little inquiry in *London*, might have satisfied you, that S. C. hath no people to feede in publike. If Doctor *Feathes* booke bee named, it must be with a double Epithite, *feeble and passionate*. I will make no comparisons in the former; but I dare say you are no inferior to him in the latter; not doubting of Mr. *Marshall*s will, yet (you say) *you see that he wants some skill in pleading for the Lords day*; you can judge the Lion by his paw, from a very few words you can conclude Master *Marshall*s abilities: yet his will is praise-worthy; you have known some well opinionated of their own skill, yet have wanted will to plead for it; for my selfe I find no other dealing, though the least, yet I think I have the greatest load. Mr. *Vines* touching on this subject, may not put the birth priviledge into a marginall reference, but he must heare of it, and be schooled for it, pag. 78. Mr. *Calamy* cannot speake his thoughts (it may be at table or otherwise occasionally,) but hee must also in print be told of it, yea none may dare to speake for it under paine of your high displeasure, and sharpest censure; falling upon Mr. *Vines* a second time for the same (supposed fault) pag. 104. you adde your &c. This brings to my thoughts a speech, that I once heard from the Doctor of the chaire in *Oxford*, upon an occasion (by many well remembred) *hoc est (said he) artificium Iesuiticum, nolunt nostros vocari doctos, nolunt nostros vocari claros, &c.* they will not endure that any of our men, should be stiled learned, famous, or the like, and (I think) you know the way of the *Index expurgatorius, dele doctum, dele insignem, &c.* If there were not a jumping of good wits in A. R. and *Bellarmines* interpretation of 1 Cor. 7. 14. (which passage caused your anger so much to swell against Mr. *Cook*

pag. 79) yet you see where it may be found, you and they have here both one peice of artifice, but I have more reall things, whereof I may complaine, which I shall in their place also mention.

*Seet. I. I. The salvation of dying infants cannot be by any scripture grounds asserted by those that confesse originall sinne and deny their right to Baptisme.*

**A**Mong those speeches, which you complaine, are brought in to worke preiudice in the minds of hearers, some words of mine pag. 33. are mentioned speakeing of three hornes in Mr. *Marshall's* syllogisme (which you say you do not feare) after the nameing of two of them, you adde these words, *I find Mr. Blake stands much upon this in his birth-right priviledge pag. 17 where he saith the Anabaptists in this present age, well see, that all, that sojourn in this tenet, saile betwene those rocks, either to affirme that infants dye in their pollution, and perish in their birth-sinne, or else to deny this originall corruption, or any birth-sin at all.* This I delivered, not by way of preface, but in the most candide manner (as you especially might discerne) in an argumentive way to shew the danger that necessarily follows this opinion; yet I have heard of it before, by one that will not deny originall-sin, but (to avoid this consequence) denyes that any are damned for it, whatsoever it may deserve, yet it never receives the wages of death. He will have all infants, *Heathen* and *Christian* saved, as having nothing in them to damne them, and saved by the application of Christs death, yet without any chang wrought in them; Infant-election he confesseth, Infant-change or conversion he wholly denyes. Mr. *Blackw.* storme of Anti. part. 2 pag. You make the like challenge, but take another way of defence. You say you see no reason of this (that I say) *unlesse it be granted that no infant can have sin forgiven, unlesse it be Baptized.* If you had said unlesse it be Baptizeable, you had spake somewhat to the purpose; the question is not whether any in sin unbaptized, but *how any in sin unbaptizeable can be saved, whether those that acknowledge the guilt and guilt of originall sinne, can from any scripture grounds make good the salvation of infants, and deny their right in Baptisme.* And if you see (as you say) no such danger following upon this opinion, I must tell you, that either you are more quicke, or else more dimme sighted then all writers both Protestants and Popish, that have disputed the truth and grounds of infants salvation; and here, I pray you, take into your consideration, how this controversie about infants salvation hath beene carried on, by both these parties; Protestants affirme, that infants without actuall admission



admission to Baptisme (though not without right of Baptisme) are saved This Papists deny. The maine arugment wherewith Protestants assert it, is the covenant of God, in which, with the parents, infants are included; they know not how to defend infants salvation, & deny this extent of the covenant unto them. This Papists deny, as not knowing how to avoid the salvation of infants; but that they are in the ordinary way of Gods dispensation saveable, when they are thus admitted, within the verge of Gods promise. That scripture therefore 1 Cor. 7. 14. in this controversie is still brought in by our Divines, as evidently holding out, a covenant-holinesse, and consequently salvation of infants; let *Chamier* speake for all; he quotes *Martyr*, *Beza*, *Aretius*, *Piscator* for this interpretation, and havinge refuted yours together with two other expositions, concludes, *Sola illa remanet Calvini. & omnium nostrorum*; There now remaines (saith he) only the exposition of *Calvin*, and of all our Divines, and entering upon the exposition of the text, he saith, *Longa hac materia est, & a Papistis vehementer impugnata*, here is a large businesse vehemently opposed by the Papists. It were ealie to be large in reckoning up Papists, that have opposed this exposition. *Bellarmino* is large in confutation of it; though he knowes not what to give for the meaning of it, yet this must not be the meaning. *A lapide* upon the place hath these words, *Hinc Calvinus & Beza suum dogma de traduce justitie hauserunt, docentque fidelium filios propriè esse sanctos, et sine baptismo salvari, quia hoc ipso, quo fidelium sunt filij, censentur esse in ecclesia nati iuxta fadus divinum, Ero Deus tuus et seminis tui Gen. 17. 7. quemadmodum iure civili censentur liberi, qui ex altero parente libero nascuntur*: hence *Calvin* & *Beza* have drawn their opinion of derivative holinesse, and teach that the children of beleivers are properly holy, and saved without Baptisme, because in that they are children of beleivers, they are accounted borne in the Church, according to that divine covenant, I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed, Gen. 17. 7. as in the civill law, children are accounted free borne, either of their parents being free, but they are deceived. And *Estius* upon the place, together with the *Rhemists*, that *Calvinists* from hence hold, that Christian mens children are holy from their mothers wombe. How can you thinke to close with Papists against us in the premises, and with us against them in the conclusion? Perhaps you may name some one, or two of our Protestant writers, that joyne with you in your interpretation, and we on the other hand can gratifie you with Popish writers, that forsake your exposition; *Estius* gives his reason against it, *Salmeron* closes with us (as you may see) in *Chamier*, and gives the same interpretation with *Calvin*. In your prologue, you tell us of *Musculus* a writer (as you say of good esteeme

esteeme, who, in his comentary upon that place, confesseth that he had formerly abused it against the Anabaptists, but found it impertinent to that purpose. Yet he though (he without cause) leaves us in the interpretation of that text, yet keeps with us in the thing it selfe, disputing largely & solidly for covenant-holinesse, and the derivation of it from parent to child, as among the Jewes, so also among Christians, as may be seene in his comment on *Mat. 8. 11.* Thus having observed the carriage of this dispute concerning covenant holinesse, and salvation of infants following upon it, and unto what party it is that you are ioyned, I shall now in a word, or two, examine.

1 What you have to say in their defence, that split themselves on the second rocke, the denyall of originall sinne.

2 What you say, for your selfe, to avoid the first, which is infants perishing in their sinne.

3 I shall bring my reasons (that while you hold their birth pollution) you cannot by any scripture grounds give us any hope of their salvation, for the first of these, you excuse them,

1 *A tanto.*

2 *A toto.*

If most of the Anabaptists (you say) hold universall grace, freewill, there may be as much said of most of the Padobaptists, takeing in a great part of the Papists & almost all the Lutherans & Arminians. But for those that would be thought most averie to Papists, Arminians, to fall away from us to them, to hold the worst in Popery and Arminianisme, is not that, I hope (as well as you love that party) that you will defend.

2 You say if they deny originall sin, it is their dangerous error, but it is not consequent on their denying Padobaptisme. I confesse it is not consequent, if they will yeeld that (as they are children of wrath by nature) so they hopelessly lie under wrath, without redemption. In the next place, you excuse them *a toto.* The late confession of Faith made in the name of seven Churches of them in London, Art. 4. 5, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26. will (you say) abundantly answer for them in this point of Pelagianisme. I doubt lest that abundantly might rather have been spared, and that the community, of those of that opinion in London, will not be concluded by the subscription of those 15 persons; many witnesses will affirme, that such Doctrines are frequently broached in their congregations, which stand in full contradiction to severall articles in that confession, which you mention. For the second you would winde your selfe out of the danger of the other rocke of infants perishing, and therefore you say, *May it not be said, that some or all infants are saved notwithstanding their birth sinne by the grace of god electing them,*  
putting

putting them into Christ, uniting them to him by his spirit, forgiving them their birth-sinne through Christs obedience, although they be not Baptized. And so it may be said (if we will speake without booke) that some, or all the Heathens, as well infants, as those that are of yeeres are saved) but from what ground of scripture it may be so said, I would willingly learne; and indeed you have no more to say, then bare preogative, for the defence of your opinion, and leaving all scripture revelation, you run thither still for shelter, which is the third horne in Mr. Marshall's syllogisme, which you avoid (as you say) by running full upon it; you would be loth so to avoid the danger of a canon, in casting your selfe upon the mouth of it. The text of scripture, that you can bring (which we have over and over) is that *God will have mercy on whom he will have mercy*, telling Mr. Marshall, that it is bad to say that god doth not save *pro bene placito*, which no adversary of yours will deny; But god is pleased in his word, to make known the way of the dispensation of his mercy; otherwise, the vilest person against whom, in your ministeriall way, you denounce gods iudgements, may reply against you, that his hope of salvation is as good as the best, for god saves *ex bene placito*, and *hath mercy on whom he will have mercy*; and the best soule in a case of desertion, will take off all your application of comfort with the close of that scripture, *And whom he will, he hardneth. Rom. 9. 18.* And so the Iewes, even in their rejection, for which the Apostle speakes so largely, being cutt off by unbelife, might have pleaded their hope of salvation, as well as in a believing condition. We must therefore, not looke to the secret will of god, of which no reason can be given but his good pleasure; but into his revealed will, where he is pleased to make known the dispensation of this will and good pleasure of his, and so we shall learne, not to carry our hopes beyond his promise; and thus you may see, that while you deprive the infants of Christian parents, of all promises, you deprive them of all Scripture-hope of salvation. Where, as Mr. Marshall notes it as an absurdity, that *salvation by Christ is carried out of the Church, where he hath made no promise*, You answer by distinction, that if Mr. Marshall meane by the Church, *the invisible Church of the elect*, then it followes not that if the infants of Indians be saved, salvation is carried without the Church, for they may be of the *invisible Church of the elect*; so I might say (if I durst use the like boldnesse) that the stones of the streets may be saints in Heaven, for God is able of those stones to raise up children to Abraham. Matt. 3. 9. But if Mr. Marshall (you say) meane it of the visible Church, you cannot say no persons without the communion of the visible Church are saved; you give your reason; He that could call Abraham in *Ur* of Chaldaea, Iob in the land of *Ur*, and



and Rahab in Iericho, may save some amongst the Turks and Indians out of the visible Church. I wonder how this fell from your pen, if God take men that are without, and bring them into the communion with the Church visible for salvation; then (with you) it follows that there is a hope of the salvation of those that live and dye without any such communion; you might have given your opposites leave, to have made use of this, by way of objection, this was *Abrahams* and *Rahabs* condition, they were taken into the visible Church for salvation, for *Iob* (I know not what you know but) I cannot tell in what age he lived, but I am sure he lived not out of all Church communion, as appears by the Church ordinance of sacrifice to the true God, which he used. If his sacrifices were not in the place appointed, yet this is not enough to dischurch him, and his children; You further say to Mr. Marshall, You will not call Rome a true visible Church, nor will you, I thinke, say, that all are damned that are in Rome. You know the Homonymy that is in the word true, which I shall not now discusse, I only say, that I know no hope of salvation for any in the Church of Rome, further then in Gospell covenant, (which still is with them though dimme and corrupt) they have a promise; you say Protestant Divines, as *Morton de Ecclesia*, and others against *Bellarmino*, understand that saying, *Extra Ecclesiam non est salus*, without the Church is no salvation, of the Church invisible. And doe not our Divines (if you make any account of them) hold that the invisible Church is (in Gods ordinary dispensation) within the visible? as the wheate is in the floore, the pure corne in the field, the vessels of honour in the house. That the visible Church is of extent more large then the invisible, and not the invisible more larg then the visible? I am sure our greatest Divines understand the truth contained in that speech (whosoever it is) of the Church visible. I meane first, of *St. Luke*, *Acts* 2. 47. The Lord added to the Church daily, such as should be saved in the Church, there is the Church visible. The next is *St. Paul* *Ephes.* 2. 12. *Israel* was a visible Church, to whom pertained the promises, and the covenant, *Rom.* 9. 4. and the *Ephesians*, while they were aliens from the common-wealth of *Israel*, and strangers to the covenant of promise, they were not (as you speake) put into Christ, and united to him by his spirit, and so saved, *ex bono placito*, but without Christ, having no hope, and without God in the world. And here let me mind you of an argument of *Chemnisius* in his common places. *De Bapt. Infant.* A Divine above *Bellarmino* standing, *Extra Ecclesiam non est Salus* &c. out of the Church there is no salvation, where there is neither ministry of the word, nor Sacraments. But the promise of salvation belongs to Infants; therefore it is necessary, that they be admitted into the Churches Society, which argu-

ment of his, he does not doubt but will convince (as he sayes) *omnes Saxos*. And may I not speake to you in those words quoted by *Vossius de heresi Pelagij*. pag. 592. *ex scriptore Hypugnosticon*, chainging only the epithite, which I will not put upon you, not deserving it, *Finge (Pelagiane) locum ex officina dogmatis tui, ubi alieni a Christi gratia, vitam requies & gloria possidere parvuli possint*: Devise (Antipædobaptist) a place out of the shopp of thy invention where little ones, that are strangers to the grace or promise of Christ, can obtaine the life of rest and glory. If we may carry our hope of salvation beyond the limits of Gods promise, I know not then whether we may not carry it perhaps to the devills with *Origen*, or to the damned in-bell with *Costerus* the Jesuit, and others, yet that speech out of the Church is no salvation, is not so rigidly to be understood, that all not actually admitted, but according to the Apostles words, *all aliens and strangers from it*, as without any right of relation to it, are excluded. Independents, that hold that there is no communion with the Church visible, unlesse by covenant (which some of them confesse their reason without scripture hath found out) admitted in a congregationall way, yet they confesse men qualified though never admitted, having right, though never actually received into Church fellowship may be saved: So we that goe the expresse Scripture way, to admitt men into Church communion (whether infants or those of years) by Baptisme, do freely acknowledge, that those, that have truth of title (whether infants of beleevers or catechumens) are in a state of salvation, though never baptized, and therefore we readily subscribe to this which you quote out of the Schoolemen, *as corrupt as they were, yet they could say the grace of God is not tyed to the Sacraments*. But I suppose you cannot find any of the Schoolemen (whether corrupt or sound) that would affirme, that the grace of God in any promise of the Gospell is granted, and all priviledge of the Sacraments and title to them denied. Thus having seen what you say, it remaines, that in a word, or two I should make good, that no hope of infants salvation can be expected by them that confesse their originall corruption, and deny them all title to the Church, and right to Baptisme.

1 Scripture leaves the infants of Heathen without hope of salvation; we find their defilement, shutting them out of Heaven: 1 *Corin.* 15. 50, we find nothing there of their redemption. But all infants, Indian & Christian, with you in present (relative to any relation to God in covenant,) are in the same condition. pag. 35. You professe your ignorance that God hath made any such promise to be the God of beleevers, and of their seed. & so the seed of beleevers (not actually believing) & the seed of Indians are both alike strangers to the covenant.

2. Scripture leaves heathens of yeeres in an hopelesse condition, as you acknowledge where you disclaime the opinion of *Zwinglius*, that *Hercules*, *Aristides*, *Socrates*, *Numa* and such like Heathens, are now in Heaven. But *Hercules*, &c. and such like Heathens are (according to your opinion) in equall hopes of salvation, with the infants of Christians, which I shall thus demonstrate. If the hopes of infants be above these Heathens for salvation, either it must be, because of their innocency in themselves, or their interest in Christ; but infants in neither of these have any advantage above such heathens.

1. Not by vertue of their innocency; their originall pollution alone, as well as with the addition of actuall sinnes, debarres them of salvation; all that this comparative innocency (without interest in Christ) helps them, is *ut minus ardeant*, that their paines in hell may not bee so intolerable: For any interest in Christ, they are both alike, both lying in negative, and neither in privative unbelief: These heathens never refused the offer of Christ more than infants.

2. All Aliens from the Church and strangers from the Covenant of promise, are without hope of salvation; this is the Apostles argument, *Ephes. 2. 12.* to prove that the *Ephesians* once were in that hopelesse condition, *quæ* Aliens and strangers; and *quæ* tale (you know) is *omne*; but infants (denied all interest in the Covenant, and right to Baptisme) are Aliens from the Church, and strangers from the Covenant of promise, and so without hope of salvation: and so you see, that avoyding one of these Rocks, you suffer wracke upon the other. In your comming from this second peice, you say to Master *Marshall* thus, *I have entred your out-workes, now I will try the strength of your Walles.* In which posture, a Souldier would tell you that you stand in a great deale of danger, unlesse, as you had entered them, so you had been master of them, which (me thinkes) you should not have such a working fancy as once to imagine.

#### CHAP. IV.

*The text Gala. 4. 29. vindicated, and the distinction of births as once applied to Abrahams seed from thence asserted.*

**Y**Our third part is concerning the arguments from scripture for Infant-baptisme, in which you determine, that *Infant-baptisme* cannot be deduced from holy Scripture. Where Mr. *Marshall*, having laid down severall conclusions, in the examination of his first, you make some animadversions upon



upon him for that he placeth (as you say) among the third sort of Abraham's seed, Proselytes that were selfe Justitiaries, and carnall professors, which you soone passe over, and presently pag. 40. you fall upon me in these words, *But it is yet stranger to me, that which Mr. Blake hath pag. 9, where he saith, that there yet remaines, in the bosome of the Church, a distinction of the seed of Abraham borne after the flesh, and after the spirit. And that now by vertue of being borne after the flesh, some have a Church interest. And applies that of Gal. 4. 29. even so it is now to children borne of believing parents after the flesh, as having thereby title to Church interest; which passages (you say) are very grosse though he makes this the medium of his fourth argument. You might have scene that it is; at the best, but one branch of the medium in that argument; and if you had intended any ingenuous dealing, the whole of the argument might have been brought to light without such chopping and changing, as the reader will soone see, if he compare your words and mine; My argument to prove a covenant-holinesse, derived from parents to children, which in this place you meane, is this, If there yet remaine in the bosome of the Church children borne after the flesh, so that distinction of births (as applied to Abrahams seed) still hath place among believing Christians, & that which fully answers Circumcision of the flesh, remaineth among Christians, likewise then it must needs follow, that there is in the Church that priviledge of birth-holinesse still continuing. And after a full confirmation of the consequence, the Assumption is delivered in these words. But there yet remaines in the bosome of the Church of Christians, those, that have no other title or interest then by vertue of birth after the flesh. This distinction of births, which they say is abrogated, is of the same force and use now, as it was when Abraham was alive, and that which is full paralell with Circumcision of the flesh still remaines: for prooffe of the former branch in the Assumption, there presently followes: The former, namely distinction of births, we have from St. Paul; But as then he that was borne after the flesh, persecuted him that was born after the spirit, even so it is now. Gal. 4. 29. How is there truth in this assertion of the Apostle, that so it is now, if this distinction of births be now abrogated, and abolished? Which interpretation of that text, there touched upon, how grosse soever in your opinion, when yours and mine shall be both untwisted, the grosser peice (perhaps) may prove your own; let us therefore heare your fine exceptions.*

1 You say, whereas the Apostle by being borne after the flesh, meanes not infants borne of believing parents, but those that are under the covenant of manant Sinnei, that is who sought righteousness by the Law, and not by faith, Mr. Blake meanes, by being borne after the flesh, birth by naturall generation of infants borne

borne of Christian parents. Here is your bare affirmation, but I am in expectation of a reason. Let the reader then attend not what I say, or what you say, but what the text saith, about which the question now is, whether in the Apostles words any distinction of births literally and properly taken continuing in the dayes of the Gospell, is to be found, or whether the whole of the text must be drawn into an allegoricall sense of two covenants in mount Sinai and Ierusalem. For the clearing of which in the words we are to observe.

1 The History.

2 The mystery by way of Allegory.

3 The paralell by the Apostle observed.

The History we find, V. 22, 23. out of the booke of *Genesis*, concerning which, I beleeve, you are not such an *Origenist*, but that you beleeve the letter of the scripture, That *Abraham* had indeed two such sons; That there was an *Ismael*; and an *Isaack*; and that *Ismael* was borne after the flesh, and *Isaack* by speciall promise.

The mystery or allegory we find V. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. which, whether it were the full intent of the Holy Ghost in *Genesis*, (so that *Ismael*, and *Isaack*, were *Typi destinati* (as was the scape Goate, the brazen serpent and other types in the Law) purposely appointed of God for that end, to shadow out these two contradistinct covenants, or whether they are *typi facti*, the Apostle drawing an allegory from thence, for illustration of a truth, as marriage hath not been supposed to have beene made for any type of our communion with Christ, but serves elegantly to illustrate it, I will not here dispute; but in what sense soever these types be taken, I observe in your interpretation, a threefold (you will be offended if I borrow your word, grosse) mistake.

1 You make the Apostles paralell to looke at the allegory, and not at the history, when the text makes it plaine that the Apostle looks at the history: Then and now are both adverbs of time, and relate to *Ismaels* joeres in person, not to the malignity of men of the covenant of workes, against those of the covenant of grace.

2 You shut out the literall sense of birth after the flesh, both from the history, and paralell, and bring an allegoricall sense in both, when the contrary in the text is evident; for though *Ismael* be a type of one under the covenant of workes, yet that *Ismael* himselve was a Iustitiary, and that he sought righteousness that way, & persecuted *Isaack* under any such notion, as a man for Gospell righteousness, Scripture hath no one word, or so much as any colour.

3 You make birth of the flesh and birth of the spirit, two contradistinct species of births, that both cannot be incident to one man no more then a man can be a brute beast, or a brute beast a bird, full as opposite as workes and grace are in the Apostle, *Rom. 11, 6.* If borne of the flesh, then not of promise; if of promise, then not of the flesh, when it is plaine, that here is not any distribution of a genus into severall species, or of the whole into its severall parts, but a distribution of a subject according to its severall adjuncts. Some men enjoye only the one of these, others attaine to both; they differ as Circumcision of the flesh, and Circumcision of the heart do differ: some are Circumcised in flesh only, and some both in flesh and heart; they differ as the Church visible and invisible do differ: some men are members only of the one, and some men are members of both.

As a dogmaticall & justifying faith differ: every one that hath a justifying faith, hath an Historicall or dogmaticall faith, but not on the contrary: many have such a faith, which never reach to the faith that justifies; it is here every one borne of promise, or as the Apostle speaks in the application of the history, is borne of the spirit, is also born of the flesh; but every one that is born of the flesh is not therefore born of the spirit. *Isaack* was born of the flesh, whether you take it in the most proper sense for one born of naturall parents (though a miracle was seen in his birth, yet) *Abraham* was his father after the flesh, or in the sense more common in Scripture for the outward prerogatives that accompany such a birth: *Paul* was borne after the flesh, as appears in his own words *Phi. 3. 4.* *If any thinketh that he hath whereof he may trust in the flesh, I more;* and then presently instances, as in his Circumcision, so in his pedigree of the stocke of *Israel*, an Hebrew of the Hebrews, and yet *Paul* also was borne of the spirit. *Christ* himselfe was born after the flesh, *Rom. 9. 5.* or more fully, *2 Cor. 5. 16.* *Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh; ye though we have known Christ after the flesh, that is for any of those outward priviledges, that this birth doth confer, yet now henceforth know we him no more:* which instances make it appeare, that these births are not contradistinct the one to the other, as the severall covenants of workes and grace, by you somuch insisted upon, but one is a step to the other.

2 You say, *whereas he sayeth, that such are born in the bosome of the Church, the Apostle saith, they persecute the Church, and are cast out.* The Apostle doth not say, that they are cast out, but mentions a comand of casting them out; the argument then holds on the contrary, whether you looke into the allegory or history, they are in the Church, otherwile they could not be cast out; *Ismael* was in *Abrahams* family, and the *Galatians*, that desired to be under



the law, were in the Churches of *Galatia*. Yet *Ismael* was not cast out, because a iustitiary, though he was a type of their casting out; so that they must not inherit; and methinks it should be no strange thinge to you, that the Church should suffer perlecution of her own members.

3 Whereas he makes such *Abrahams* seed, he therein joynes with *Arminius* against the truth, and against the Apostle, &c. Where I pray you, do I make such *Abrahams* seed? those words are not mine; but yours; mine I have set down *totidem verbis*, as they are in the birth Priviledge; I speake of a distinction of births, as applied to *Abrahams* seed still remaining in the Church, but I call neither of them by the name of the seed of *Abraham*. This I do not say to leave Mr. *Marshall* in the thing, which, I doubt not may be made good out of scripture; but this I say, that, though, that of his should fall, yet my argument holds in its full strength: If therefore there be any grosseness to be found, it is no grosse error of mine, but a grosse device or calumny of yours.

4 Whereas the covenant of grace is made the reason of baptizing infants, by alleadging this place for baptizing of infants, to be borne of *Hagar*, that is to be in the covenant of workes, should give a child interest into the Church of Christ, This I suppose, will now fall of it selfe; I speake of birth after the flesh, and Circumcision in the flesh, according as scripture speakes of it in the letter, such a one was *Ismael* in *Abrahams* family, not of iustitiaries persecuting the Church actually cast out of it. This you call a cloudy argument and what can it be other, when your misty glosse is put upon it? but I suppose by this time, the cloud is scattered, and the bright Sun-shine appears.

## CHAP. V.

*What that expression meanes, children are taken into covenant with their parents.*

**I**N your examination of Mr. *Marshall*s second conclusion, after a great deale more paines then needs to find out his meaning, when he sayes children are taken into covenant with their parents, whether he meane it in respect of saving graces, or the priviledge of outward ordinances, expressing your selfe pag. 45. though the latter is no more true then the former, yet it is lesse dangerous, pag. 46. you adde these words, And the truth is although in some passages, (especially Mr. *Blake*) you speake more warily, as if you would avow only a covenant for outward priviledges, as when Mr. *Blake* saith, pag. 14. This birth right intitles only to outward priviledges, yet, Here the question is only about the meaning of your adversaries, in their expressions;

me thinkes, my words sufficiently speake my meaning, though you find the like cloud upon them, as you did upon my former arguments: Is that but (*as if I meant*) when in expresse words, far from ambiguity, I declare my selfe? yea my words are yet more full, in the place by you quoted, had you pleased, to have expressed them; my words are, *regeneration workes gracious qualifications, this birth-right only entitles to outward priviledges*; but you say in applying those texts *Gene. 17. 7. Act. 2. 39. Matt. 19. 14* you expresse your selves as if you meant, the covenant, whereby salvation is promised by Christ, and so I do mean without any colour of contradiction, these two being subordinate & not opposite: the word & sacraments are outward priviledges; & the one containes, & the other seales promises of salvation by Christ; those texts (you say) are plainly meant of saving graces, and how I pray you, are they meant of saving graces? immediately and absolutely, do you meane? then the two first Scriptures will conclude, that all the Jewish Church, and every person there, was saved: Circumcision was a signe of this covenant; God was the God of all that were Circumcised; if to be their God in that place absolutely includes salvation, then all Circumcised in flesh were saved. That promise *Act. 2. 39.* is a promise belonging to all the Jewes, and their seed; if this infallibly conveighs salvation; then all the Jewes are saved. Most, that have opposed Pedobaptisme, speake in that manner of the Jewes, as though all were damned, putting them out of any covenant of grace, and under a covenant of workes; as may be seene in Mr. Blackwood, and A. R. his treatise of the vanity of Childish-baptisme, you speake of that covenant, under which they were to be so of grace, that it absolutely, immediately, and necessarily confers saving grace, on all that are under it: when, the truth is betwixt these extremes, and maintained by those, whom you oppose as adversaries. For the third Scripture *Matt. 19. 14. Of such is the kingdom of Heaven*, did you never read, that the kingdome of Heaven might be taken from those that for the present are interested in it? *Matt. 21. 43.* or if you should limit it to the kingdome of glory, that speech only impliyes a capacity of glory in Gods ordinary way of dispensation, and not a certainty to inherit: and for that reason, to be admitted to a Church priviledge as by them, that presented them, was there desired: you further say, *Baptisme seales only the promise of saving Grace, remission of sins &c. and therefore, if there be not a promise of saving grace to infants, in vaine are they baptized, the seale is put to a blanke as some use to speake.* That is a speech of those that mistake the seale, and the adequate subject of it according to Scriptures. The Sacraments are not (as the spirit is) priviledges and seales of the invisible, but of the visible Church

Church; they seale our purchased possession, not absolutely, but conditionally. I have heard you affirme, that Baptisme is rightly administred to every professor of Christ, and if the seed were interested, then the seed of every professor, as well as the seed of the regenerate, were to be Baptized. But these professors, for a great part are not in the covenant of grace, in that acceptance, as you understand it, so as certainly to be saved. This argument of yours is indeed *Bellarmines lib. 1. cap. 14. De sacra. in genere. If Sacraments* (saith he) *were testimonies of grace, in particular conferred upon any, then often times they would prove false, when they are administred to one that faines himselfe to beleieve, and beleieves not; and so consequently, it were unlawfull to baptize any, lest we should cause God to beare witness to a lye: for we are sure of none, whether they beleieve truly or whether they only faine themselves to beleieve.* To this argument *Amesius* answers, that Sacraments are no evidences, compleat and absolute, but upon condition to the beleieving; to which we may adde, of that answer of a good conscience, *1 Pet. 3. 21.* mentioned, *Amesius* doth adde they are understood with condition in respect of those that do not beleieve. *Bellar. ener. Toms. 3. cap. 1. lib. 1. quest. 4. sect. 11.* but pag. 16. (I say) God promises to be a God in covenant to his, and their seed; which people in covenant have also a promise from him, of the spirit. And do not these outward priviledges (to which I say a Christians birth-priviledge entitles) containe a promise of the spirit? The Oracles of God are the greatest of priviledges, & they containe large spirituall promises; and the visible Church, to whom these oracles are committed, hath these promises, and every visible Church member. If any object, why then are not all baptized infants saved? why are they not all possessed of saving graces? to this we answer, as from *Amesius*, so also out of your own words, pag. 42 *That some promises do suppose a condition: such is the promise of the spirit, as I there understand it, and you may see in Christs words Iohn 7. 39. in the Apostles words Ephes. 1. 13.* And indeed I never saw a learned man so run himselfe into a maze needlessly, as you in this discourse do; being at a stand, you say, whether Mr. *Marshall* meanes a covenant of grace, or outward ordinances, as though these two were opposite, and priviledge of ordinances were not of grace, or that saving grace could be had, in Gods ordinary way, without this priviledge. The priviledge of ordinances is a necessary step to saving grace. Christians and their seed, have the former certainly, the latter conditionally, and therefore the former may be called a covenant of saving grace, as the word is called, *the word of salvation, a great salvation.* And salvation is said to be of the Iews. The priviledge of ordinances containes the termes of the covenant, which is to be distinguished from the possession of



of the grace covenanted : every one that enters covenant, doth not reach the salvation or mercy covenanted : the entering into it is one thing, the keeping of it is another. I have heard you say against Antinomians, that the covenant, of grace hath its condition, and I say, every one that enters, doth not performe the condition; so that in conclusion, I now say, professors of faith conveigh to their seed an interest in that covenant, which is of ordinances, containing this covenant, which when they observe, and put in the condition required, then they obtaine the mercy covenanted. *Andas, Simon Magus, Alexander, Hymeneus, Phileus* and those compared to the rocky ground, all entered the covenant, though, perhaps none of them attained salvation covenanted. The Sacramentall signe is sometimes by a *Metonymia signi*, called the covenant *Gen. 17. 10.* sometimes by a *Metonymia effecti*, the mercy covenanted is called the covenant. *so Iere. 31. 31. 35.* But a covenant, properly, is the agreement betweene parties: the earnest in a bargain, is not the covenant; neither is the summe which is given in pay, the covenant: so in the covenant betwixt God and man, the covenant is the agreement between God and the professed beleever, upon the termes or conditions which God himselfe tenders : into which all Israell entered, and to them therefore appertaine the covenants *Rom. 9. 4.* and into this all Christians enter. Whereas you say, *that to our seed should be conferred visible Church priviledges, to be members of the visible Church, partakers of Baptisme, is but a dreame ; the scripture nowhere explaining it so, and being so understood were not true, there being many of the seed of beleevers, that neither de facto, in event, nor, de jure, of right, have those visible Church priviledges to be members of the visible Church, partakers of Baptisme &c. and if there were such a promise, God could not take away the candlesticke from the posterity of beleevers ; which he threatens Rev. 2. 5.* This objection riseth up against God himselfe, rather then any one of your advertaries. The covenant did once reach to the seed, in this sense that we explaine it; that was once scripture that God would be the God of beleevers, and of their seed. It was made to *Abraham*, continued to *Isaack, Jacob* and to *David* : yet he did remove the candlesticke from the ten tribes, that were interested in this covenant, and many of the seed of *Abraham* himselfe, at this day have neither *De facto, nor jure*, any Church priviledges. To this I further answer in the words of *Mr. Ball.* In this covenant therefore the internal efficacy, and outward administration is to be distinguished, or some things are absolutely promised, or if upon condition so as God will make good the condition ; others are conditionally promised, so as they take not effect, because the condition was not made good. In the second sense many things were promised which never tooke effect, and yet God is faithfull and true because the condition was broken. *Ball of the covenant pag. 152. 153. You say pag. 16. Noth-*

do I doubt, but your meaning is according to the Directory, which directs the Minister at Baptisme, to teach that the promise is made to beleivers, and their seed: which promise what it is, appears by the words following, make this Baptisme to the infant a seale of adoption, remission of sins, regeneration, and eternal life, and of all other promises of the covenant of grace. If you please to interpret (as I beleeve they will interpret themselves) the seale, a seale compleat, and full by the performance of the condition, in Baptisme required, and the promises mentioned, to be the grace promised, then all is full and cleare in the Directory. You goe on in five severall reasons, against Mr. Marshall, as you conceive his meaning. That the covenant of saving grace expressed Gen. 17. 7. in these words (I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed) is made to beleivers, and their naturall seed: Which being understood according to your meaning, that saving graces are conveyed, and the mercy covenanted, by birth-priviledge, conferred, no man shall be more ready then I to joyne with you in your conclusion, though not in your premises, where large animadversions might be made on severall passages, but yeelding the conclusion as by you it is senced, I leave the premises to be examined by those that appeare as adversaries; only, I cannot passe by one passage of yours, in your fourth argument; Where you say to Mr. Marshall, he that shall heare you preach, that the children of beleivers are in the covenant of grace, and that they, that are in the covenant of grace, cannot fall away, may be apt to conceive himselfe within the covenant of grace, without repentance and faith, and that he shall be saved without obedience, and so lay a ground worke for Antinomianisme, and consequently Libertinisme. I know not how Mr. Marshall preaches, having seldome (though sometimes been his hearer, nor how you preach in this particular. I think, I may say, I never heard this preached, neither do I remember, that I have read such expressions; I must confesse my selfe one of those, that have, and yet God willing, may preach the contrary, though, with my best abilities, I shall stand with you, for the perseverance, and against the apostacy of men in a regenerate condition; what will you say of those that remembered that God was their rock, and the high God their redeemer; yet were not stedfast in his covenant, Psalm 78. 35. 37? These were a people within covenant. Neither doth this evacuate the arguments of Mr. Prim, or any others for perpetuity in grace, or justify Bertius his Hymeneus Desertor, as you object pag. 52. Men having entred the termes of the covenant, & declared themselves to be a people of God in covenant, may apostatize; though the person in grace is qualified with regenerating graces, is in a sure and stablished condition. If Bertius meane no more, Hymeneus was a desertor, when he made ship-wrack of the faith, 1 Tim. 1. 19. That faith which he lost, did denigrate him a man in covenant.

though his loosing of it did discover, that his heart was never right to the covenant. How plainly soever, I have declared my selfe, in this particular, in passages by your selfe quoted; yet in your last argument, I am brought in as an adversary: *Lastly* (you say) if this were true that the covenant of grace is a birth-right priviledge, then the children of beleevers, are children of grace by nature; for that, which is a birth-right priviledge, is a priviledge by nature; and if, as Mr. Blake saith, pag. 6. of his booke, Christianity is hereditary, that, as the child of a Noble-man is Noble, the child of a free-man is free, the child of a Turke is a Turke, of a Jew a Jew, the child of a Christian is a Christian: then Christians are born Christians, not made Christians; and how are they then Children of Wrath by nature? which, whether they may not advantage Pelagians, and denyers of originall sin, it concerns those that use such speeches to consider. And where, I pray you, do you find these words, that Christianity is Hereditary? those are no words of mine, but a supplement of yours. Mr. Marshall may not use a phrase of his own, *ad faciendum populum*, to please the people (as you conceive) but he must heare of it pag. 41. Why then do you take liberty, to joine a phrase and put it upon me, for the very same reason, in the sense that you understand it, and as in the whole series of your discourse, you put it off to be understood? you know it will sound as odious, and to me it is no other then odious; I would, you would forbear such devises; I beleeve no such thing that parents convey to their children (as by birth-priviledge) a being in Christ-Iesus: If you would understand by Christianity, the bare name or title of Christian, together with right to Church priviledges, then I shal owne the thing, but disclaime the expression; and then there are not only foure, but five termes, in that last argument of yours.

*Covenant of grace*, which is one terme in your syllogismes, (if put into a syllogisme-forme) is taken, either for the admission into the termes of the covenant, and Gospell conditions, or for the actual possession of the graces conditionally promised. *Parans on 1 Cor. 7. 14.* teacheth to distinguish *inter sedus, & beneficia faderis*.

*Nature* (which is another terme of yours) is either taken properly, for the qualification of nature, or more largely, and vulgarly for descent and off-spring. That the mercies, conditionally granted, are ours by any qualification of nature, is a position, which in the very page by you quoted, I disclaimed: but to say, that men by priviledge of birth are admitted into conditionall covenant with God, as interested, in righted to ordinances, is no more then the text (I was upon) will warrant. Jewes were in covenant with God, and Paul, and Peter were Jewes by nature; and that I had no other meaning by severall rules there layd down (too long to be repeated) I declare at large. You make Your inferences



upon my words, then Christians are born Christians, not made Christians, how are they then Children of wrath by nature? This is the argument of Stapleton, Bellarmine, and *A Lapide* the Iesuits, to which, *Parus* answers that, *In ecclesia non nascimur Christiani regenerati, nascimur tamen Christiani regeneranti*; by birth wee have Christian priviledges, putting us into a hopeful way of regeneration, though not possessed of regenerating graces.

The other branch of your objection he answers, by distinguishing of nature as before. And whereas you charge this as giving advantage to Pelagians, and denyers of Originall sin. I do not take upon me to know all that Pelagius and his followers held, though I have read somewhat in them that have refuted them and have scene extracts of their errors; but I never read this once, that Christian parents convey to their posterity their own title, and as they propagate inward defilement by nature, so also a right to outward ordinances by speciall priviledge. If you can make it appeare that this was not alone their opinion, but charged upon them as their heresy, then, as *Arminius* once said, it might be a question whether *Semi-Pelagianisme* were not good *Christianisme*; so I shall put a quere whether this peice of *Pleni-Pelagianisme* be not good *Christianisme*; and further I demand, whether *Pelagianisme*, had been good Divinity in the dayes of the Prophets; that my Divinity had been good Divinity, it is on all parts agreed. In your addresse to Mr. *Marshall*, upon occasion of the like speech pag. 54. You say, you do very carnally imagine the Church of God to be like Civill corporations, as if persons were admitted to it by birth; whereas in this, all is done by free election of grace. For this very thing, our Protestant Divines are taken up by *A Lapide* the Iesuit in 1 Cor. 7. 14. and even in the selfe same words for substance: *Ecclesia non est civilis Respublica, sed supernaturalis, & in ea nemo nascitur Christianus, sed baptismo, uti & olim Circumcisione, Genes. 17. spiritualiter renascitur quisque, & fit sanctus, non civiliter, sed realiter per fidem, spem & charitatem anima infusam*. You have sucked the spirituall meaning from the Iesuits, when Mr. *Marshall* holds to the carnall imaginations of Protestant reformers. It was thus amongst the Jews: It is so in all civill kingdoms and corporations, in all religions. It is a priviledge communicable, & in its own nature descendable; no scripture can be produced, to shew, that it should cease to be so in Churches, of Christians, It is the Apostles argument in like case, that, because it is among Jewes and Heathens, it is also among Christians, in respect of religious communion 1 Cor. 10. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. Protestant writers produce many texts of scripture, where this birth-priviledge in their thoughts is evidently set forth, yet Iesuits contradict it, and therefore it is a carnall imagination to conceit it. Mr. *Marshall* (you say) hath nothing but dictates: but you come in with your rea-

sons. The Apostle knew not, that had God so by promise or other engagement bound himselfe, but he was free, as he said to Moses, after the promise made to Abraham, to have mercy on whom he would. Rom. 9. 15. If you meane any engagement of God to confer saving graces or habituall qualifications on the naturall seed of beleevers, your words then carry reason with them; but this you might easily see, is neither my meaning, nor Mr. Marshall's. I say the sonne of a Noble-man is noble, the sonne of a freeman is free. I do not say the sonne of a learned man is learned, nor the sonne of a regenerate man is regenerate. You further adde, *To conceive, that it is in gods Church as in other kingdoms, and after the laws of nations, is a seminary of dangerous superstitions and errors.* If there were no paralell held betwixt the Church of God and other kingdoms after the law of nations, but such as are seminaries of superstition; how then hath the Church in scripture the name of a City, Family, Kingdom? similitudes ever carry some resemblance, and if this were the alone ground, on which the birth-priviledge of Christians were bottomed, you had said something; but being only an illustration, in your censure you are overlavish; similitudes indeed may be over-stretched beyond their reach; and if you had laid down rules to declare where the similitude holds, and where it holds not, as I have done in the birth-priviledge, and made it appeare, that it holds not in that for which I produce it, you had said somewhat to the purpose, read *Mala. 1. 6. 8. 14.* and tell me, whether there be any ground laid for dangerous superstitions.

## CHAP. VI.

*The text from Rom. 11. 16. vindicated, and a covenant hollinesse from thence asserted.*

Pag. 62, you come to that text *Rom. 11. 16.* in which after much time spent, more to obscure, then cleare Mr. Marshall's meaning, and all because you will admit no faith, but that which is saving, nor any covenant entred, unlesse the thing covenanted and promised be possessed; you presently deale with Mr. Marshall (for ought I can find) according to your usuall dealing with me, charging him with that which he never said, that *our grafting in is answerable to the Jewes; and their infants were grafted in by Circumcision; therefore ours are to be grafted in by Baptisme.* Which words if Mr. Marshall owne, I must professe my selfe to be of another mind. The covenant it selfe, and title to it, must preceede the signe and seale of it, pag. 66. I am challenged for uttering an untruth more plainly then Mr. Marshall, Mr. Blake pag. 8 more plainly, *The branches of*

*Ancestors, are roots of posterity, being made a holy branch, in reference to their issue, they now become an holy roote; this (you say) is not true for &c. Here therefore the question is, what the Apostle means by roote, Rom. 11. What faith that is, by which we are ingrafted in the rootes, and what the branches necessarily receive from the rootes, whether liberty of ordinances or saving graces. You make Abraham the roote; the faith whereby we are ingrafted, to be only the faith that justifieth; and that which we receive from Abraham the roote, to be saving graces; which tenet of yours, unlesse you can clear it better, then you have done, seemes to me, to be attended with the great ill of absurdities, and to stand in the most full contradiction against the Apostle. If the ingrafting be by a saving faith, only to derive saving graces personally inherent as a fruit of election from Abraham, then it must needs be that we are elect in Abraham, Abraham may say without me you can do nothing, and he that beleeveth in me, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water, and we may say, the life that we live in the flesh, we live by faith in the son of Terah: this must necessarily follow, If Abraham be the roote not only respectively to a conditionall covenant; but to the graces under condition covenanted. It had been more safe with you, with Mr. Blackwood (though in contradiction to himself) to have made Christ the roote, when these consequences must follow. And as these absurdities follow, so also flat contradiction against the Apostle with them.*

1 There then can be no falling away unlesse (to use your own phrase) *Bertius his Hymeneus Desertor* may be defended, and his *Ap. stacy* of the *Saints* maintained; there could be no present defraction from the roote, as you call it. But we see, the Jewes are fallen, there is a present defraction, they are broken off, they are are cast off, Rom. 11. 19 20.

2 The same fullnesse that the Jewes did partake of in this Olive (where Abraham is the roote, whereby they did transcend other wild branches) we do partake of being grafted in for them. This is plaine Rom. 11. 7. But they did hereby partake of liberty of saving ordinances, Rom. 3. 1. by being of that body, and not of gracious qualifications.

3 By the same faith, from which Israell fell, we stand in this relation of holinesse, as it is plaine Rom. 11. 20. but they fell not from a faith that justifies; therefore it is not faith, that justifies, by which, in this respect, we have now our station and present being, as branches in Abraham. You and I agree well enough in this, that Abraham is the roote, though we are farr enough wide in the manner of ingrafting, or priviledges derived from him. But your reason is worth hearing.

That Abraham is so the roote, there is no other intermediate roote, *In the Apostles resemblance* (you say) *Abraham is a holy roote, or at most Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in whose names the covenant runs. No other man*



though a beleever, is the father of the faithfull but *Abraham*; *Isaack* and *Jacob* must then (it seemes) be cast out from among the number of men, for they are roots by your own confession. Yet no man but only *Abraham* is a roote.

2 You make no difference between a father, and the father of the faithfull. The former I confesse was proper to *Abraham*, as the leading man in the covenant, but not the latter. *Adam* alone was the father of all mankind; yet as you had another father, so also you are a father, and all those, to whom God hath given issue; what make you of *Jesse*? I pray you, is not he expressly called a roote, *Isa. 11. 1.* what made *Abraham*, *Isaack* and *Jacob* roots (as in nature so holy roots) but the covenant? and was not the covenant made as well with *David*, as with *Abraham*, *Isaack*, and *Jacob*? And as God is pressed with his covenant with them, so also with his covenant with *David* *Psal. 132. 10. 11. 12.* I cannot reach this mystery, that *Abraham* can be a roote of all the branches in *Israel*, reaching down to the Apostles times, no intermediate roots intervening, no more then *Adam* can be a naturall roote of man-kind to this time, without intermediate fathers of our flesh deriving us from him; as *Jacob*, with *Rachel* & *Leah*, was a roote from whom *Israel* sprang, as branches of an Olive; so *Judah* & *Tamar*, *Boaz* and *Ruth* were roots likewise; They built up the house of *Israel*. *Ruth. 4. 11. 12.* the House of *Israel* was this Olive-tree: these severall metaphors expressing the same thing, the building of the House, & bringing out the branches are one and the same. All builders are rootes, these were builders, therefore rootes. *Abraham* may be called the builder, laying the first foundation, so the roote from whence every branch was derived; yet every particular beleever that had issue, a builder, a roote; or else there were no force in that plea of the Psalmist, *O Lord truly I am thy servant, I am thy servant and the sonne of thy handmaid. Psal. 116. 16.*

## CHAP. VII.

The text *1 Cor. 7. 14.* vindicated and explained.

Seet. I. The *Corinthians* had their scruple concerning infants born of one beleaving, and another unbeleaving parent; whether they were to be accounted uncleane or holy.

**P**Ag. 69. You come, (you say) to Mr. *Marshall* principall holde, against which, I marvile you had not prepared some stronger batteries; and seconding Mr. *Blackwood* in his storme (as he sayes) of Antichrist, I more marvile that you would go down for most of your engines to the Romish *Philistin*: it is strange that they should lend them for their service. You agree with Mr. *Marshall* in one peece of the state of the

question, that the *Corinthians* desired a resolution from the Apostles, whether it were lawfull for them, who were converted, still to retain their infidel wives, or Husbands. But for any scruple concerning their children, that you deny, saying, the *Corinthians* had no doubt. Whether their children were unclean and so be put away; for the Apostle argues from the uncleanness of their Children a thing that appeared absurd to them; they took it as a common received principle, that their children were holy, as rightly *M. Thomas Goodwin* at Bow-church. Here, in this section of yours, the question is not one but manyfold.

1. Whether the *Corinthians* had any scruple, or desired resolution from the Apostle, concerning the condition of their children borne of unbelieving parents? You bring for the negative the authority of *Mr. Thomas Goodwin*, in a sermon preached, not printed, where I was a hearer as well as you, and I dare affirm, that you do abuse him: He said (as many will witness) that the Apostle in those words [*Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy*] might be understood either as reasoning from a common received principle, that such children were holy, or else, answering a scruple of the *Corinthians* doubting least the issue of these marriages were unclean, & not holy; and his hearers, at the first delivery, understanding him, that the Apostles words might beare both senses, leaving it indifferent, which sense they would take, when indeed they are inconsistent. A scruple cannot be a common received principle; a brother (now with God, well known to you; as I had it from his own mouth) spake to him of it; whereupon the next lecture *Mr. Goodwin* explained himselfe, and whether sense he inclined to I appeale to your selfe for witness, who say in the words that presently follow, that *M. Thomas Goodwin* seemed confident, that the occasion of their doubt was, a scruple which they had concerning their issue, gathered from *Ezra 9. & 10.* could it be both a scruple & a common received principle? You proceed, and for the occasion of the doubt, though I deny it not, but the *Corinthians* might know that fact *Ezra 9. & 10.* yet that the reading of it was the cause of their doubt, I see no evidence nor likelihood, though *Mr. Blake* pag. 12. takes it a granted, joyning with the relations (*Ezra 9 & 10.*) that resolution  *Hag. 2. 12. 13.* as the occasion of the doubt. I never tooke it for granted, that the *Corinthians* scruple had its first rise from the reading of either of those scriptures, but I did, & still do, take it for a thing granted, that when they doubted, whether their married society as husband and wife, were lawfull, or no, because one party was an infidel and unclean, that they had their scruple also concerning their children, whether they should be holy with the believing parent, who was within, or unclean with the unbelieving who was without the Church. And the Apostle, in his answer speaking to the case concerning children, so borne, as well as to that which concerned the parents, makes it plaine, that they put their doubt concerning

My reason why I take this for granted, is, because the Corinthians were rational men; nay, the Apostle saith, *Chap. 10. 15.* they were wise men, able to judge in Customes, both Heaehenish and Jewish. Now they knew, as it was with the Parent, so ever it had been with the Child in Church relation. The Parents being in Covenant, the children could not be without; and the Parents being without, the children could not be within. Now in this case the Parents being divided, the one being without, the other within the verge of the Covenant, they must needs be at a stand concerning the issue; yea, though the marriage were concluded lawfull, and to be continued, yet the scruple concerning issue, still remained. And there being but one Text in all the Scripture, where their case is expressly set down and determined, yea determined against them, as well in respect of themselves for the continuance of their married society, as their issue, it is more than strange that they should be wholly ignorant of it. They wrote by common consent, and that none should know this case so opposite to their purpose (and that of the Prophet, which seems so to illustrate it) may well be admired. But you stay not in the negative, to tell us barely where their scruple was not; but you proceed *page 71.* in the affirmative, and say, *In my apprehension, it is farre more likely, that the doubt arose from the Epistle he wrote before to them, mentioned 1 Corin. 5. 9. Not to keep company with fornicators or idolaters, which might occasion the question, whether they were then to continue with their unbelieving yoke-fellowes.* Here, I wish the reader to take notice whether of these he judges to be most likely. 1. You know well, that many will not yeeld that Paul wrote any Epistle to the Corinthians before this, but as this carries the title of the first, so there was none before it; and this they do, to make it good, that no Scripture given by divine inspiration is lost; which would impeach, as they fear, both the providence of God, and the faithfulness of the Church to whom the Oracles of God were concredited. See the *Præface to King James his works.* And for answer to this place, *Chrysostome* tels you, that the Apostle refers not to another Epistle, but to a former passage in this Epistle, *Chap. 5. 2.* But let it be granted, that he wrote another Epistle, which he here mentions, yet the tenth verse seems to be his present further explanation, and no part of the contents of that Epistle formerly written, and so there is no roome left for your conjecture; and put the case further, that the ninth and tenth verses do both expresse the contents of that Epistle, yet why do you take both the ends, and leave out the middle? making their scruple to be their converse with husbands or wives fornicators or Idolaters, and not as well with covetous or extortioners? If this conjecture of yours hold, the Apostle thus



writes to the Corinthians: If any brother hath a wife that is an Idolater, Fornicator, a Drunkard, or Extortioner, let him not put her away. It must needs be that the Apostle takes in every part and peece of their scruple, and so the question about Divorce, so much agitated, would have been determined. It is wonder, that *B. Howson, Bunney*, and others (that say *Moses* permission to put away wives was in case of Adultery only; the uncleanness or nakedness mentioned, *Deut. 24. 1.* is Adultery, and now no divorce lawfull) could not have hit upon this Text. If the Apostles words had reached to Fornicators in this resolution of his, as well as to Idolaters, then the question whether Adultery did dissolve the marriage knot, would soone be satisfied. Your acquaintance with Master *Whearly* was I think too late, otherwise you might have saved him the pains of a retractation in this thing, which he ingenuously published. And I pray you speak, whether you do beleieve, that the Corinthians took it for a common received principle, that if a man had an adulterous wife, that his children were legitimate and not bastards: so it must be, if your opinion passe for a reason.

*Sect. 2. The unbelieving party is instrumentally sanctified in the procreation of issue the beleiving party doth sanctifie.*

**A** Second question here is, *What is meant by sanctified, where it is sayd by the Apostle that the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband, and the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife.* Having reckoned up severall meanings of sanctification, which all rejected, page 72. You say, there remains only two senses, the one of an instrumentall sanctification, as Master *Goodwin* calls it, for the begetting a holy seed; The other of matrimoniall sanctification, whereby the one is enjoyed as a chaste yoke-fellow by another without fornication. For instrumentall sanctification you say, page 75. You know not of any before *M. Tho. Goodwin*, that hath so expounded it; when in my knowledge you heard it over and over in the conference that *London Divines* had with you about it: and I pray what make you of those words of mine printed many moneths before Master *Goodwin* preached on that subject. Birth priviledge, page 11. *The unbelieving, whether husband or wife, contributes nothing to this holiness; all that they do, is, that (being married to a beleever) they are no impediment: they are sanctified, they do not sanctifie. The sanctifying power to the producing of the holiness of the issue is made proper to the beleiving party; the unbeliever is sanctified, so that both together make an holy root, to produce an holy branch.* And in answer to Master *Blackwood*, the unbelieving is only passive and instrumentally sanctified, to the procreation

creation of a holy posterity, page 107. Against this (which you say, Master Marshalls words intimate, that he seems to imbrace) you bring your reasons, 1. *This could not have resolved the doubt, in case of those, who by age could not be sanctified to this end, or by reason of accidentall inabilities for generation, they might depart each from other, notwithstanding this reason: whereas the Apostles resolution is of all husbands and wives; the unbelieving husband is sanctified, that is, every unbelieving husband is sanctified.* And is not this argument of yours of as great force against your own interpretation of a matrimoniall, as ours of an instrumentall sanctification? Such may beget children by Covenant as well as legitimate. The sanctifying by the believing party here mentioned, respects the issue, which (as it is plain in it self by the Apostles reason, *else were your children unclean, but now are they holy*, so) you also confesse, in grounding a legitimation of issue upon it. This sanctifying (whether instrumentall or matrimoniall) hath its influence upon the seed; such a brand lying on all the issue, where there is issue (be it bastardy or gentilisme) were enough to conclude against all such marriages, one principall end of marriage being posterity. 2. You say, *if the Apostle, by being sanctified, meant instrumentally sanctified, to beget a holy seed, then the reason had been thus; you may live together, for you may beget a holy seed. And so their consciences should have been resolved of their present lawfull living together from a future event, which was uncertain;* I know you cannot ignorantly, and therefore I fear you wilfully mistake: the meaning is, you may live together; for all the seed that you beget, are holy infallibly, and necessarily holy, as the seed of infidels (neither parent believing) are necessarily and infallibly unclean; as certainly as a married man and woman (whether Christian or Heathen) do beget a legitimate issue, a Noble man and woman do beget a noble issue; so sure a man or woman holy by Covenant of God, do beget issue federally holy; so that here is a future certainty, and not contingency, and it is not possible to imagine a more full and determinate answer: and therefore you needed not to have urged the authority of *Chamier*, as you do, page 73. in a thing in which (among those that maintain a federall holiness) you have no adversary. As for those that will maintain a holiness reall personall (as they call it) in the issue to be here understood (or as you observe, page 67. that I call it qualitative and inherent) I leave them to speak for themselves, confessing my self unable to answer this argument of yours from *Chamier* in their behalf; but sure *Chamier* (who asserts this Covenant holiness) was not so unhappy a Logitian as to frame an argument for over-throw both of himself and his adversary against whom he there reasons. One reason of yours to make this good, that

the Apostle argues from a thing not contingent is observable; therefore (you say) he useth the preterperfect tense *ἡγιασται*, hath been sanctified, you in probability he speaks of a sanctification even when both were unbelievers, for he saith *ἡγιασται*, twice in the preterperfect tense, and he mentions the unbelieving distinctly, but the beleever without the expression of his or her faith under the title of husband or wife. This is a reason borrowed from Stapleton, in which, it seems, you do not much confide, as indeed there is no cause. Whence hath the unbelieving married party this sanctifying, but from the beleaving yoke-fellow? This already was taken of birth-priviledge, page 11. 12. It is the wife of an unbelieving husband, the husband of an unbelieving wife, when the marriage is between a beleever and an unbeliever.

3. You say, when any person is said to be instrumentally sanctified for a purpose, this sanctification is ascribed to God, as Jer. 1. 5. Isa. 13. 3. as selecting some from others to such an use; but here the sanctification is common to all unbelieving husbands in respect of their wives, and comes from that common relation not speciall designation. Here you beg the question, and reason flat against the Apostle. That sanctifying which the Apostle mentions, is a result of the faith of the beleaving yoke-fellow, the unbeliever is twice said to be sanctified, but not the beleever; the beleever doth sanctifie, if any sense can be made of the Apostles argument.

4. You say; according to this exposition, the words following could not be true, [Else were you children unclean, but now they are holy] for in this forme of reasoning, this Proposition is included. Their children could not be holy without that sanctification, — for their children might be in Covenant and be regenerated, though their parents, by reason of their unbeliefe, had been neither of them sanctified to the other, for the begetting of a holy seed. Understanding the Apostle of instrumentall sanctification, and of federall holinesse, the proposition is most true, necessarily and universally true, as the issue of such a birth, they are federally unclean and unholy; if afterwards by grace they are changed, this is no fruit of their birth, of which the question is in this place, but of the Gospel work in their souls. In your close of this dispute you adde. Now let this be granted (as of necessity it must) then the uncleannesse must be understood of bastardy, and the holinesse of legitimation, (for no other holinesse followes necessarily to the children) in that their parents marriage is lawfull, and they born of such parents; but legitimation, nor any other uncleannesse followes upon the denying of it, but bastardy; and therefore, who ever they be that interpret it of legitimation, they do it rightly, call them how you will. But this being denied (as of necessity it must, seeing nothing that you have said carries so much as any colour or appearance of reason) the uncleannesse cannot



cannot be understood of bastardy, nor the holiness of legitimation. Another holiness necessarily followes from such marriages, where one or both parties are beleeving: Another uncleanness necessarily followes from such marriages where neither are beleeving, which is holiness and uncleanness federall; therefore whosoever they be, that interpret it of Covenant holiness or uncleanness, interpret it rightly, and they that interpret it of legitimation and bastardy, interpret it corruptly. And this is made a third question what is meant by *holy* and *uncleane* in those words of the Apostle [*Else were your children uncleane, but now are they holy*] And to confirme your owne interpretation, so magisterially laid downe, you say, *we are to consider*, 1. *That the words* [*Else were, &c.*] *are not a resolution of another doubt, but an argument to prove that which was said last, as the particle* *ergo* *shewes*; for the termes are argumentative, as much as quoniam tum, because then used, so 1 Cor. 15. 14. 29. Rom. 11. 6. to prove that which went before: You might have seen that these two are not inconsistent, when one doubt necessarily flowes from another; and a resolution of the second serves to the clearing of both; as in this place it is manifest. When the Corinthians doubted of the lawfulness of their married society, the legitimation of their issue, (which you say, they never questioned) was a strange argument to satisfie, and indeed had been altogether unsatisfying: for though children were legitimate, yet other reasons might be brought (or at least might be supposed to be of force) against the continuance of their marriage-society. Other reasons are brought, *Deut. 7. 4.* against such marriages. Such were separated in *Ezra's* time, yet no such thing as bastardy of issue ever mentioned. A satisfying reason for the continuance of their marriage-society, we have, verſe the 16. fully removing those jealousies that might arise in their minds from the place quoted, *Deut. 7. 4.* 2. You say it is an argument *ab absurdo*, from an absurdity which would follow. Which you clear, in putting it into forme; *If the unbeleeving husband were not sanctified by the wife, then were your children uncleane; but they are not uncleane, but holy; Ergo, the unbeleeving husband is sanctified by the wife.* Now the major of this Syllogisme is conditionall, and the sequell of it were not true, if this proposition were not true, *All the children of those parents whereof the one is not sanctified to the other, are uncleane.* Your faculty in Logick would appear to be a great deal better, if you would please to put out the whole of your skill in disputation. I appeale to your selfe, whether the truth of that sequell, by you rightly laid down, do depend upon that proposition which you draw from thence. Is the Apostles major proposition of parents in generall, or of one parent beleeving? and another unbeleeving in particular?

culat? The truth of the Apostles sequell depends on this proposition, *All the children of an unbeliever are unclean, unlesse for generation, he or shee be sanctified by a beleever.* In proof of any proposition, whether Categorical or Hypothetical, simple or conditionall, you must keep to the terms; whereas you shut out unbelieving, which is twice expressed, and beleeving which is twice necessarily implied; this proposition, if you will oppose, I shall defend: Now make up the proposition; as by the Apostle it is laid down, according to your interpretation; *All the children of an unbeliever are bastards, except in generation, he or shee be sanctified by a beleever;* and this proposition, if you will defend, I shall oppose, and let that opinion, which chargeth an untruth on the Apostle, be shunned, and that which upholds the truth of the Apostles argument be followed. You further say, *if the sanctification be here meant of matrimoniall sanctification, as I have proved it must, and the uncleannesse be meant of federall uncleannesse, so as to exclude them out of the Covenant, whether of saving graces, or Church-priviledges, the proposition were most false:* May not I retort this, if the uncleannesse be meant of federall uncleannesse, so as to exclude them from Church-priviledges, as Chamier saith, all Protestant Interpreters have proved, and the sanctification be meant (not of instrumentall but) of matrimoniall sanctification, so as to legitimize them; The Apostles proposition were most false, and therefore instrumentall sanctification, not matrimoniall, is here understood. As much weight may well be laid on my interpretation (borrowed from the Protestants, opposed by the Jesuits,) as upon yours (borrowed from the Jesuits, and opposed by the Protestants,) unlesse wee could have here somewhat towards a reason for your interpretation. Mixe a Protestant truth with a Popish error, and the conclusion (which ever followes the worst part of the premises) will be erroneous. And therefore, whereas, in the close of your latine jear of Calvin and Chamier; you say, *Omnesne nati ex iis parentibus, quorum alter non sanctificatur in altero, sunt extra fœdus gratiæ? Nunquamne parentes fideles aut fornicantes gignunt liberos intra fœdus gratiæ futuros? ita oportet sane aut ridiculam hanc esse interpretationem.* Are all borne of those parents, whereof one is not sanctified in the other, without the Covenant of grace? Do fornicating or unbelieving parents never beget children that shall be within the Covenant of grace, or federally holy? So it must be verily, or this interpretation is ridiculous. I answer, *Omnes nati ex parentibus infidelibus (quorum alter non sanctificatur in altero) sunt extra fœdus Dei. Parentes infideles nunquam gignunt liberos, ex seminis prerogativa, sanctos. Ista vocabula [fornicantes, futurum] sunt commenta tua, non occurrunt in verbis Apostoli, nec Calvini, nec Chamieri,*

et; *Spurii* (*fornicantium proles*) *nullo avo sunt futuri legitimi*; non ergo sequitur infidelium liberos (*ex natura fœderis expertes*) nunquam in futurum gratia Dei esse federatos; non est itaque interpretatio Calvini vel Chamieri ridicula; ast animadversio tua est ridiculosissima: All those that are borne of unbelieving parents, and one of them not sanctified in the other, are out of the Covenant of God, unbelieving parents never beget children, by birth-priviledge, holy. Those words [*fornicating [that shall be]*] are your own device, they are not to be found in the words of the Apostle, nor yet of Calvin and Chamier: Bastards [*the seed of fornicators, shall never be legitimate, it doth not therefore yet follow, that the children of unbelievers (by nature void of the Covenant) shall never be, thorow the grace of God brought into Covenant:*] And therefore it is not the interpretation of Calvin or Chamier, but your glosse upon it, which is ridiculous. Whereas you adde page 77. That it must be understood of holinesse opposite to the uncleannesse mentioned, I willingly yeeld, and do assume, the uncleannesse being not bastardy, but a state out of Covenant (which is alwayes the condition of the children of infidels) the holinesse can be no other but a Covenant holinesse. You proceed, as for Mr. Blake, quære page 11. Whether we will give the like interpretation of Gal. 2. 15. which is (saith he) every way paralell, and answers in either of the branches. Doth the Apostle here meane, We that are by birth legitimate, and not bastards of the Gentiles. I may apply to him the words of him in the Poet, *Cernimus? an qui amant, ipsi sibi semina fingunt?* Do we see? or do they that love faine dreames to themselves? For I cannot tell how to interpret this passage, that 1 Corin. 7. 14. and Gal. 2. 15. are every way paralell, and the one to be interpreted by the other, any otherwise, then as a conceit in a dreame, like as when the fancie from gold and a mountain compounds a golden mountain: Surely, reason was at a low ebbe, when all this Rhetorick in the last page and this must come in, not only upon me (but Calvin and Chamier) to mak supply of it. If it be a love-dreame, I assure you, I am yet in it, all this noise hath not at all startled me from it: such rattles will not serve, I look for reasons: may not you as well judge your selfe asleepe, as me in a dream? You know who said *Quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus*, and sure, were you well awake, you would have been at paines, after all this noise, to have made some dissimilitude appear between them. You go on. For his argument, which he drawes from the text, on which his discourse is builded, in that the Apostle contradistinguisheth Jewes by nature, and sinners of the Gentiles, to prove that the infants of beleevers are in the Covenant of grace, and have a birth-priviledge for baptisme, it is a riddle to me. Is it the fashion, I pray you, for men in dreames to put riddles, seeing you leap



leap so suddenly out of a dreame into a riddle? You might have done well, being so broad awake, to have put my riddle or proposition (whatsoever you do call it) in mine owne language, seeing you bring it in a distinct Character, marked out with your marginall Comma's, as mine. My proposition on which I build my discourse, is, *A people that enjoy Gods Ordinances, convey to their issue a priviledge to be reputed of a society that is holy, to be numbred amongst; not unclean, but holy persons.* The Reader may soon see, that you have scarce hit on a word of mine. *Covenant of grace*, as it is not in those words (that I remember) to be found in the Scripture, so I think it cannot be found in that Treatise for Baptisme. Whatsoever I speak by way of inference, yet I have not the word in the conclusion drawn from the text, nor yet any peece of the confirmation of it, before I come to application. You go on to show the meaning of the words of the Apostle in that place, as by way of Parenthesis, before you had begun; Which I desire you to compare with my explanation of the words, page 2. and see whether they be not almost the same *in terminis*, which I shall not now here repeat. I well know, and have sufficiently declared, that the subject, which the Apostle is upon in the one place, is far different from that which he handles in the other; but this I shall maintain, that the Apostle *Gal. 2. 15.* takes the same thing for granted, which in *1 Corin. 7. 14.* he doctrinally layes downe, and so, as to this purpose, the paralell is full. I never knew two Scriptures more paralell, that were not the same.

1. The Apostle *Gal. 2. 15.* by nature meanes birth, or descent from Ancestors; using the word in the vulgar acception; as I have proved. So your selfe acknowledge. So in *1 Cor. 7. 14.* That he speaks of birth or descent from Ancestors, speaking of children of a beleeving and unbeleving parent, is undeniable.
2. Jewes by nature or birth, put in opposition to the sinners of the Gentiles, can be no other *Gal. 2. 15.* but holy by birth. A holinesse of birth *1 Cor. 7. 14.* (flowing from a parent beleeving and in Covenant) is asserted likewise.
3. Sinners of the Gentiles *Gal. 2. 15.* must needs be uncleane by birth, and an uncleannesse in opposition to the Jewes holinesse is understood; so uncleannesse, *1 Corin. 7. 14.* is birth uncleannesse there put (as you say) in opposition to holinesse; one instance making good some dissimilitude, would have been better then all these reproaches. You proceed page 78. *Therefore when Mr. Blake saith, that he contends to have the seed of beleeving parents under the Gospel, to be under the first member of the division of the Text; It is a strange speech, that he should contend to prove this. The seed of beleeving Gentiles are Jewes by nature, borne to be circumcised, and to keep Moses law.* Your dealing inforceth

to let down my own words, as page 10. they are delivered. The seed of beleeving parents under the Gospel must be lookt upon under one member of this division in the text; the Apostles distinction is full and compleat, either they must be accounted of the people of God, who are relatively and federally holy, as were Jewes, or else out of the number, and under the second head of unholy, and out of Covenant, as were sinners of the Gentiles; a third cannot be assigned; the Apostles distribution may not be challenged. If it be under the first head, that they are looked upon, we have what wee contend for: If under the second head, then the heathen doom of Gentiles, sinners, aliens, is theirs. In which, it is, that infants of beleevers are by me put under the first member, not in all respects, but respective to the generall notion of relative and federall holinesse. A satisfying answer would have done better then a falsification; either to have assigned what member of the division they must be under, or to have showed that the division is not full, so that they may be out of both. And what if I had said that I do contend, that they are Jews by nature, that is, by birth and descent? It must not therefore necessarily follow that they were born to be circumcised, and keep the Law: the name Jew or Circumcision is not alwayes used properly, but sometimes allusively. Circumcision made a man a debtor to the whole Law, Gal. 5. yet you cannot deny your self to be of the Circumcision, in the Apostles language, unlesse you will exclude your self from those that worship God in spirit and in truth. Phil. 3. 3. A Jew outwardly and a Jew inwardly, is a Christian outwardly and a Christian inwardly, Rom. 2. 28, 29. The Jewes sometimes were the only people of God, and all the people of God (by way of allusion to that state) are still so called. But you see (it seems) that this put off will not serve your turn, and therefore you adde, but let it be granted, that they are called sinners in the sense he would have it, that is, out of Covenant, as it is said, Ephes. 2. 12. the question is in what sense the Gentiles were without the Covenant, and the Jewes in. Grant this (as you know not which way to shift to deny it) & then you see in what case you leave infants of beleeving parents; even dogs, unclean, aliens from the Common-wealth of Israel, without God, without Christ, &c. That is the state of the Gentiles, Ephes. 2. 12. as by your self presently after is expressed, and so you are full split on one of the rocks before mentioned, that there is no more hope of a Christian infants salvation then of the salvation of Numa, Hercules, Aristid. Socrat. Plato, Arist. (according to your tenet) is now acknowledg'd: which is further yet manifest in your words that follow. It is certain (you say) that the Jewes had by Gods appointment the priviledge of Circumcision, and the Covenant made with Abraham did belong to them in speciall manner, and the Oracles were with them, Rom. 9. 4, 5. and the Covenant of saving grace was a

among them — and that the Gentiles were dogs, &c. Then it is as certain, that infants being out of Covenant, and wanting the priviledge of Baptisme, the Covenant of saving grace is far from them, and so their case is reckoned, not among Jewes, but Gentiles. And so (you say) it may be granted that the Jews had a birth-priviledge, though it is certain that their birth-priviledge did not entitle them to the Covenant of grace. I desire to know of what use this birth-priviledge was unto them; it could be no priviledge, unlesse it interested them in, and entituled them to some benefit. That it made them a people of God in Covenant-relation, cannot be denied: God by vertue of this Covenant owns them, and calls them his people, 2 Chron. 7. 14. Isa. 1. 3. Hos. 4. 6. and I know no other Covenant that is a priviledge, but the Covenant of grace: The Covenant of works, I beleve, you scarce account any priviledge to man fallen. And although the Covenant of grace admits of subdivision, according to the variety of dispensation, and severall degrees of light, in which it appeared; yet Scripture knowes no more then those two Covenants. My position then is diametrically contrary; it is certain that the birth-priviledge of the Jews did entitle them to the Covenant of grace, they were by vertue of this title the people of the God of Abraham, and did sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in Gods Kingdom: this their Circumcision did seal, though it is confessed that all did not attain to the mercies of the Covenant, but fell short by unbeliefe and disobedience. The Covenant made presupposeth man called, it doth not promise that he shall be effectually wrought upon. Ball of the Covenant, page 154. The common priviledge of Circumcision belonging to the Jewes, did (you say) not arise from the Covenant of grace according to the substance of it, but according to the administration that then was. This is as certain as the former, if this priviledge did not arise from the Covenant of grace, then those words of Almighty God, Gen. 17. 10. This is my Covenant which you shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee, every man child among you shall be circumcised; are to be understood not with a grain, but rather with a bushell of Salt: it must be understood that it is a signe or seal of the Covenant, not in the substance of it, but some appendent circumstances: a signe and seal, as a man may say, of a by-shred of it: and how I pray you, then shall we understand that of the Apostle, Rom. 4. 11. And he received the signe of circumcision a seal of the righteousness of faith? Shall we say with Bellarmine in 1. 1. c. 17. de sacra. in genere, That this was a priviledge peculiar to Abraham, and appertaining to no other of his seed, which Chamier saies, De Sacra. in genere, 1. 2. c. 10. That no Divine ever said it before him, though Mr. Blackwood with much confidence hath spoken it after him; and how is there any such thing as circumcision of the heart, that must



needs be from the Covenant of grace in the substance of it; it were in vaine so called, if it were not in some reference to the circumcision of the flesh. You say in your exereitation pag. 2. *The Covenant made with Abraham is not a pure Gospel-Covenant, but mixt*: If Mr. Marshall or I had so delivered our selves, we had heard of it with a noise. Do you mean that there was any impurity in the Covenant as delivered to him, any ingredient to draw away from the simplicity of Christ? This sure you will not say, seeing the Apostle saies the Scripture preached the Gospel unto Abraham, Gal. 3. 8. or do you mean that there was the tender of other benefits annexed? as the multiplication of his posterity, the possession of the land of promise, as Bellarmurgeth, *De effectu Sacra. l. 2. c. 17.* So there is still to Christians in the Gospel-Covenant, godlinesse having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come, 1 Tim. 4. 8. as by Chamier is well observed against him. What promises soever Abraham in peculiar had to himself and his family, these Circumcision did seal accidentally: but the Gospel-Covenant, which is the righteousness of faith, that was it (according to the Apostle) which in substance it sealed. The Apostle doth not define Circumcision by a circumstance, but by the substance of it. You have a promise of assistance from God in your ministeriall work, Mat. 28. 20. This promise your Baptisme (if baptized) confirms; God in Christ being your God by this signe of your dedication to him, is ingaged to keep you in your wayes, Psal. 91. 11. This being your way, though not every Christians way, this your Baptisme assures. All promises are Yea and Amen in Christ, 2 Cor. 1. 20. and all promises are sealed by Baptisme in the name of Christ; the promise of the birth of the blessed seed was a signe, that Syria and Israel going to war against Jerusalem, in Abaz his dayes, should be destroyed, Isa. 7. 14. This promise Abaz his Circumcision (had he had faith to apply it) did seal; and all such like promises that we have in generall (or if they were revealed to us in particular) our Baptisme doth seal: so that the Covenant with Abraham, and with us, is the same in substance, and it is the self same thing that the Jews Circumcision and Christians Baptisme doth signifie and seal. This is the doctrine of Protestants opposed by Jesuits. Bellarmine saies, that, that which Calvin teacheth in this particular, *Nihil est aliud, quam ex lege Evangelium facere*, is nothing else but to make the Law Gospel. *De effectu Sacra. l. 2. c. 17.* You close with the Jesuits, and with high disdain shake of the doctrine of the Protestants. Mr. Blackwood could see nothing in Circumcision but that which is carnall. You indeed acknowledge a mixture, though you would have that which is carnall, to be substantiall; and that which is spirituall, to be accidentall. You go on, nor was Circumcision a fruit of the faith of the parents, but of Gods ap-

pointment, according to the dispensation of his will. You had said more truly, if you had said that it was a fruit of the parents faith by Gods appointment, according to the dispensation of his will: these are subordinate, which you make opposite. God made his Covenant with *Abraham* and his seed, to be their God, and he is the God of beleevers, *Heb. 11. 16.* When this people ceased to beleeve, God ceased to be their God; and now it is vain that they are circumcised: we by faith are grafted in for them, *Rom. 11. 20.* and Baptism now being the initiating signe in stead of Circumcision, we are of right baptised as they were circumcised. You further say that *this was a privilege in that time of the Churches minority.* Give me some Scripture, or colour of reason if you can (for yet we have none) that the fruition of promises in such a latitude, as to reach not only to a mans self, but his posterity (which *David* so much admired, *2 Sam. 7. 19.*) should be accounted a piece of the Churches pedagogy, or that this is one fruit of our redemption by Christ to be cut short in this promise, to have posterity formerly in Covenant now expunged. You go on, *he that will prove that therefore our children have such a birth-privilege, because the Jewes had, must make our case as the Jewes, and so bring in under the Ceremoniall Law:* It may do well to put this assertion of yours into a formall proposition: They that equall Christians with Jewes in privileges, must make them equall in burdens; if Christians have as great mercies, they must have them in as obscure a way, with as dim light, and with obligation to equall bodily exercise and charges: This proposition I adventure to deny, and if it hold not, your assertion falls. You go on, *I thought necessary to say so much, because Mr. Vines refers us to Mr. Blakes Sermon, as a learned Treatise, and I heard it in like manner magnified by Mr. Calamy, and therefore have thought it necessary to examine whether it hath any seeming strength in it.* And how could that reference of *Mr. Vines*, or speech of *Mr. Calamy*, put this double necessity upon you, to say so much as you have spoken? unlesse it be to perswade the world, that you do *solus sapere*, are alone awake, when all the world is in a dream, and fast asleep? It were well worth inquiry, whether ever man of wit or learning were in opinion against you in this point of Baptisme, seeing you do not only passe your censure very freely on those that you meet with in particular, but speak very homely of all in generall, as led by an *ignis fatuus* in this matter, page 94. But these thoughts of yours were reasonably well known and spoken of before you either wrote or published this letter, upon this approbation of theirs; You say, *you thought it necessary to examine what hath any seeming strength in my Sermon.* If you had said you had endeavoured to have picked out what appeared to have any seeming weakness in it, and to render it to your Reader without its nerves or sinewes,

newes; you would more have been credited, if the strength of it be worthy of all your whoopes and jeers; what would have been thought of it, if the weaknesse of it had come under examination? I hope I shall receive so much right by the name of Mr. *Vines* and Mr. *Calamy*, that the Reader will take the pains to see with his own eyes what I have wrote, and then he will soon discern your dealing. You take notice, you say, of that speech of mine, page 11. *Singular opinions put men upon singular interpretations, which may as truly be verified of himself (you say) as of his adversaries.* Not so truly; now you have made your self my adversary. Whether I or you be in the truth, it may be a controverſie; but that your opinion is more singular, I think is without dispute: All those that will own those two Epithites together, which your Licerer hath bestowed on you, *Presbyterian* and *Catapdobaptist*, I suppose may soon be numbred.

### CHAP. VIII.

*The Texts, Exod. 19. 6. 1 Pet. 2. 9. both understood and applied to the Church visible, as professing themselves members of Christ, when the true members of Christ are only worthy of that honour.*

**I**N your eleventh Section, treating of the priviledges of beleevvers under the Gospel, you tell Mr. *Marshall*, that in a Speech of his concerning these priviledges, he alludes to that place 1 Pet. 2. 9. and pag. 103. of your Letter, you say, Mr. *Blake*, pag. 8. *urgeth this text to prove a birth-right priviledge of Christians;* which argument of mine from that text, you have not patience to examine to the end, but in the midst of it you addresse your self to me, as tho the Letter had been indorsed to us both, in these words. *I desire Mr. Blake to revise his Treatise, and to examine whether this, and many other passages answer to Mr. Vines commendations of it;* concerning which (so far as concerns M. *Vines* and others whom you mention) I desire you to tell me whether a Treatise may not justly be commended unlesse every passage in it be equally worthy of commendation. I, among others, have commended your Treatise of scandals, and yet there are some passages in it which would try a stronger wit then mine to excuse. And I beleve by this time you wish that you had hearkned to that excellently learned Dr. *Wilmot*, and godly friend of yours and mine (who, in dear love to you and the Church, did in his Letters perswade to put your *deleatur* upon some things before you publisht it; for the commendation (which to you is such an eye-fore) I could have been contented it had been spared, being as little ambitious of these things as deserving. Yet (seeing you would wound, not only me, but severall others, and the cause it self, thorow my sides) I think I may without suspicion of vain glory, tell you that



that others might be named, who have given it their approbation; to name but one, your friend of the Assembly, (that, in dear love to you, told you (as you say) that a Committee was chosen to give satisfaction in point of *Pedobaptism*, and advised you to present the reasons of your doubts to them, who also delivered your Letter to Mr. *Mosell*, when your reverend father in law of the Assembly had refused that office) as after it was in manuscript, he gave his approbation, and importuned the printing of it, so he hath since spoken with as large respect as others of it. But these are but impertinencies, let me be the ignorantest (as you would make me) and your self the most learned of men (as it seems you would be thought) this will not determine the controversy, or end the dispute. Learning is not alwayes the Advocate of truth; the truth perhaps suffers by my dulnesse, and error hath advantage by your acutenesse; let me then, and not the cause suffer. Yet I cannot but say, that if I had not known you better, then in this work you appear, I should scarce have thought I had had so learned or ingenuous an adversarie. But now let us look into the Scriptures quoted by me in that argument of mine, for a birth-priviledge, or Covenant holinesse of the seed of beleivers; in which the question is, whether those texts, *Exod. 19. 5, 6. Deut. 14. 1, 2. Isa. 63. 18, 19.* do hold forth any birth-priviledge to the Jewes, to be a holy people, or holy Nation (in opposition to the Gentiles, and whether that text of *Exod. 19. 5, 6.* quoted by the Apostle *1 Pet. 2. 9.* be by him applyed there to the visible company of Christians (called by the word and professing Christ) or whether it be applyed only to the invisible body of the elect and regenerate. For the argument, I would you had put it in my own words, as in the birth-priviledge they may be found, that so the strength or weaknesse might better have appeared; and thus it is there laid down. *The grand birth-priviledge by the Jewes enjoyed, is to be an holy Nation, to have the whole body of their people (as distinguished from others) accounted holy to the Lord. This was peculiarly their honour from age to age, from generation to generation, Exod. 19. 6. Deut. 14. 1, 2. Isa. 63. 18.* But this honour, to be a chosen generation, an holy Nation, a people peculiar (phrases as high as were ever given the Jewes) is given to beleevuing Christians, *1 Pet. 2. 9.* Christians therefore in this birth-priviledge equall the Nation of the Jewes. In the conference, we had in the presence of so many select hearers, you cannot but remember that you denied the major proposition in this (or a syllogisme to this purpose) affirming that to be an holy Nation was no birth-priviledge of the Jewes, and in your exercitation, you say, that *Exod. 19. 5, 6. God speaks of a priviledge flowing, not from birth, but obedience.* It is true, that that speech there is conditionally put, to minde that people to be in deed, what they were in name and title; but that they had the title positively, as a priviledge

of birth, is evident in the texts quoted by me, together with this of *Exod. 19* namely *Dent. 14. 1, 2. Isa. 63. 18, 19.* (which you should not have concealed, to which may be added, *Dent. 7. 6.*) when they were worthy of no such title for their obedience, as *Dent. 9. 6. 13. Isa. 47. 1, 2, 3.* is evident. They are not more honoured with birth-titles then they are reproached with conversation rebellious. Now for the minor proposition, you answer by distinction, and in your exercitation say, The sense of 1 Pet. 2. 9. is, *ye which beleeve, as it is v. 7. whom God hath called out of darkness, are a holy nation, whether Jewes or Gentiles, by spirituall regeneration, as beleevers are called a family or kindred, Ephes. 3. 15. the household of faith, Gal. 6. 10. the house of God, 1 Tim. 3. 15. a people, 1 Pet. 2. 10. wherefore in this family, kindred, house, people, are only beleevers, whom not carnal birth, but spirituall, causeth to be reckoned in that number.* This then is that which you maintain, that as a family or kindred, Eph. 3. 15. household of faith, Gal. 6. 10. The house of God, 1 Tim. 3. 15. A people, 1 Pet. 2. 10. are to be taken; so the words also *a holy Nation, &c.* 1 Pet. 2. 9. are to be taken; likewise, this I willingly yeeld in all the particulars before mentioned, except the first, where *Paul* speaks not to the Ephesians in the second person (as *Peter* here to this people to whom he writes) but abstractly of a family named of God as his family, partly on earth, partly in heaven, which can be no other but the Church invisible; for, *Gal. 6. 10.* where the Apostle exhorts, *let us do good to all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith,* there is a plain distinction between professed Christians and Infidels, those within the visible pale, and those without it. For the collections for the Saints, 1 Cor. 16. 1. no wise man, I suppose, will beleeve that only men truly sanctified are there to be understood, but Saints by calling, that is, those that were removed from the society of Infidels by the profession of Christ; no more then when *Saul* persecuted, and did shut up in prison the Saints, only the invisible Church of the elect is to be understood. The Galatians and Corinthians had been put upon a task indeed, if the invisible Church had been the object of their bounty. For 1 Tim. 3. 15. *That thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thy self in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.* *Timothy* was a Minister of the visible Church, whether you take Church for the universall visible Church, as 1 Cor. 12. 28. or whether you understand any particular Church, to which he was designed, as Ephesus, &c. The Ministers of God are visible Ministers of visible Churches, neither they nor their flock are invisible. You are instructed as *Timothy*, and honoured with like imployment; yet neither *Gabriel-Fen-Church* nor the *Temple* are invisible Churches. This Church, which is here the house of God, is the ground and pillar of the truth, a ministeriall pillar to hold it forth

forth (alluding to the practise of those times, to hang their Lawes up for open view in tables upon pillars, as interpreters understand it) and such pillars cannot be invisible: If then Peter may be interpreted by these places of Paul, as you would have it, then a visible Church is meant in that place of Peter, and consequently a birth-priviledge of Christians is there held forth unto us, 1 Pet. 1.10. and yet remains, which presently shall be examined. Having seen your exercitation, let me view your Letter; when I say that the text is meant of the Church visible, and clear it, 1. By looking back to the words that percede: you say *you have looked back, and finde no such thing there*; further confessing it is true; there is mention of some who did reject Christ, v. 7, 8. But that, when Peter saies, *ye are a chosen generation, a royall Priesthood, &c.* it should be meant of any other then true beleevers, who alone can offer spirituall sacrifice acceptable to God through Jesus Christ, is an interpretation which (you say) I disclaime: Perhaps my avowing it may be of as much force with some, as your disclaime, unless you had vouchsafed some kinde of reason. You adde much more, that it should be meant of all those who do not professedly with the unbelieving Jewes reject Jesus Christ. For then it may be said, not only of Simon Magus and other hypocrites, but also of all the Salvages in the World that never heard of Christ, that they are a chosen generation, &c. The least dram of Christian candor would have spared this inference; you might easily have seen that my meaning is of those to whom Christ is tendered. A stone of stumbling lies in the way, and not hid in the earth; they that stumble at the Word, they hear the Word, and so do not your salvage Indians, and of such the text there speaks. I spake of privative, and not of meer negative unbelief. M. Blake (you say) addes, which yet will more fully appear by comparing the words of S Paul, Rom. 9.32.33. And after the easing of your spleen (as before hath been observed) you say *To me, the text he cites, Rom. 9.32.33 compared with 1 Pet. 2.9. is meant of all those who do not professedly with the unbelieving Jewes, reject Christ, as an harp and harrow, do consort to make musick.* The texts that I would have compared are not Rom. 9.32.33. and 1 Pet. 2.9. but Rom. 9.32.33. and 1 Pet. 2.6, 7, 8. between which texts, the consort is alike, as between harp and fluit, why else did our translators refer in the margin, Rom. 9.33. 1 Pet. 2.6? and why do the late Annotations on those ver. in Pet. twice referre to Rom. 9.33. and on Rom. 9.33. to 1 Pet. 2.6? my musick is the same, as theirs, which you could not but easily enough discern, but so you had lost your jest, and Mr. Vines and I with others, had escaped a reproach, which seems to be one of your main designs, as often as you flie out from M. Marsh. upon me. As for my Proof from the context, that the words in 1 Pet. 2.9. are understood of those hearers. (Now let me adde) *who do not professedly*



feſſedly reject Chriſt, The Apoſtle Peter in the former verſes, namely 6, 7, 8. (as is plain, by comparing the paralell text, Rom. 9. 32, 33.) divides hearers into two ſorts. 1. Thoſe that beleeve. 2. Thoſe that be diſobedient. To the former Chriſt is precious, they profeſſe to have him in high eſteem; to the latter he is a ſtumbling ſtone, a rock of offence: they go the way of works for ſalvation, and not of faith, Rom. 9. 32, 33. Now the Apoſtles diviſion is full, all thoſe who reject not the Goſpel, are with him in that place, beleevers, and conſequently a royall generation, &c. Among which beleevers Simon Magus in Samaria was one, Acts 8. 13. Thoſe hearers compared to the rocky ground, Luke 8. 13. The whole Church of Sardis, in which there was but a few names that had not defiled their garments, Rev. 3. 4. And if any aſke how Chriſt is to ſuch beleevers precious, as is ſaid verſe 7? I anſwer, Chriſt is to them as precious as the Word, and this they receive with joy, Luke 8. 13. Salvation is to them precious, and through Chriſt they claime ſalvation, Matt. 7. 22. Luke 13. 26. And whereas you diſclaime the interpretation that carries it to any other then true beleevers, who can offer ſpiritual ſacrifice acceptable to God. If you had my work in hand, we ſhould hear of ſeverall diſtinctions of truth, Metaphyſicall, Logicall, Morall: and of the ſeverall degrees of truth. My anſwer is, that I my ſelf underſtand it of true beleevers, the faith of each one among them being true in its kind; a dogmaticall faith is no falſe faith, though a faith that falls ſhort of ſalvation; and I underſtand it of ſuch beleevers, whoſe duty is to offer ſpiritual ſacrifice acceptable to God, among whom ſome do offer it acceptably, not reſting in a bare dogmaticall faith of opinion and profeſſion, but reach to that faith which ſaves. To which the Apoſtle alſo exhorts by an argument drawn from the honorable titles there mentioned, which titles belong to all to whom the name Chriſtian belongs: The name of Chriſtian is of as much honour as all the titles there reckoned, and that name belongs to all that hear the word and make profeſſion of it; and now I leave the Reader to judge whether you might not have kept your Harrow for your own Plough. Yo go on, But perhaps (you ſay) we may ſee more by looking forward, and then you repeat my words. Secondly, by looking forward to that which followes in the Character, which the Apoſtle (before he ends his deſcription) addes, which in times paſt were not a people, but now are the people of God. A ſpeech taken from the Prophet, to ſet forth the caſe of the Gentiles, as it is alſo by Saint Paul interpreted, Rom. 9. 26. But the Gentiles thus called, and of no people made a people, have all a Covenant-holineſſe, and not alwayes inherent holineſſe. Add there you come in with your observation upon them. Sure, the Word Nation and people did ſo run in Maſter Blakes minde,

that he could think of nothing but a Nationall Church like the Jewes, whereas, if he had weighed the words, vers. 10. of having obtained mercy, and considered that both Rom. 9. 25. and 26. are meant of the same, of whom he said, vers. 23. that they were the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory, he would have plainly perceived the people and Nation to be meant of the invisible Church of the elect, and so nothing in that text for the holinesse of a beleeving Nation, as some speak, communicating a priviledge of the seals to the infants of that Nation. You speak this language as though it were your own mother tongue. I must confesse, that when ever I think of a discipled nation, I can no more keep my thoughts off from a national Church (though not in all resemblances like the Jewes) then I can keep mine eyes from wood when I look on trees; but I desire to know why in looking forward you first make a stand (after your usuall custome) before you come to the end of the argument. Secondly, why I must rest satisfied only with a jeere, without any thing at all towards an answer. It is true, that you strive to cast a rubbe or two in the way, but I never took it to be the work of an answerer to knit knots of his own, before he hath untied his adversaries. Take in a word or two my arguments. 1. The call in the Text mentioned, is a call of a people (whether from Judaisme or Gentilisme) to Christianity. Now, such a call of a people, is a call into the Church visible. It is spoken of the whole body of the ten Tribes revolted, *Hos. 1. 10. Hos. 2. 23.* of the whole body of Gentile Nations, *Deut. 32. 21.* These Jews and Gentiles (being thus made made a people) are a Church visible, and so are a chosen generation, a royal Priest-hood, an holy Nation, a peculiar people; that they should show forth the praises of him, who hath called them out of darknesse into his marvellous light. Secondly, a people discipled to be baptized, are of no people of God made a people: these here mentioned were thus made a people: but when a people are brought so farre, as to a profession of Christ (as I have heard from your own mouth, they are discipled to be baptized; thus *Sardis* was made a people; yet the most of them spiritually dead. *Corinth* was made a people, and many of them vile. The Churches of *Galatia* were made a people unto God, when yet *Paul* was afraid that they were ready utterly to apostatize. How absurd a conceit it is, to make all professing Christians, called from Judaisme or Gentilisme (whether you please) beleevers in your sense need not to be made appear, it sufficiently appears of it self. Master Burroughs on those words, I will say to them which were not my people, thou art my people, *Hos. 2. 23.* hath these words, Were it that the Ordinances of God might be set up in their purity amongst us in England, were Reformation perfected, and the Saints walked humbly and peaceably as they should, the whole

World will be convinced that these are indeed the people of the Lord, and that God is amongst them. and yet neither Master Burroughs (whom in this peece of the dispute you take to be your friend) nor your self (I suppose) do beleeve that the Church of England thus reformed by purity of Ordinances, would be any Church invisible, or a society of such beleevers alone, as from that text of *Peter* you characterize; Now for the rubbes you put formerly mentioned, *Whereas if he had weighed, &c.* I would you had from hence made up an argument. I can frame it only in this manner. The call in this place mentioned is such, that it is a mercy to attaine unto it; but the call of a people without God, without hope, into a visible Church to partake of saving Ordinances, is no mercy; and therefore not the call in the text mentioned. Here I shall deny your minor proposition, beleeving it to be a speciall mercy to attain unto such a call as here I speak of in a visible way to enjoy Ordinances of salvation. Where you say, that *Rom. 9, 25, 26.* are meant of the same, of whom he said *vers. 23. &c.* I answer, though it were granted, that those verses were meant of the same persons, yet they might be called vessels of glory, the denomination being a *praestantiori parte*, as we call it, a heap of corn, where yet there is a mixture of chaffe, and a corn field, where there is a mixture of tares and other weeds; and as the Apostle (writing to the Church of the *Thessalonians*) saith, *knowing brethren your election of God*, and yet I suppose yee do not beleeve that each particular man was a vessell of glory, but I utterly deny that they are meant of the same. The Apostle speaking of election and rejection of particular persons, quotes a text (holding by way of analogy and proportion) which speaks of the election of a Nation; the text of the calling of a Nation out of *Egypt*, *Hos. 11. 1.* is applied to the calling of one, even of Christ, from thence *Matth. 2. 15.* So the texts of the choyce of a Nation into Covenant, *Hos. 2. 23. Hos. 1. 10.* may by the Apostle be applied unto some one or few particular ones called by grace.

## CHAP. IX.

*There is no more expresse president in Scripture for womens receiving the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, then for infant-baptisme.*

**I**N your twelfth Section, examining what command or example there is for Infant-baptisme, you meet with an objection, that there is no expresse example in Scripture for womens receiving of the Lords Supper, and there-



fore if infants may be kept from Baptisme for want of a president, then women may be kept from the Lords Supper for the same reason; and page 112. you say to Master Marshall, herein you, Mr. Vines and Mr. Blake, and generally others follow Zwinglius, whose conceit this was, if he were not the first inventor. It matters not who hath the honour of invention, so that there be truth in it, though I know no more of Zwinglius conceit then I have from your words. Master Blake (you say) expresseth himself thus, page 22. no particular president more then for this of Infants-baptisme, so that here the question is, whether there be any more expresse example for womens receiving that Sacrament, then there is for Baptisme of Infants in the Scripture. And here you are pleased to deale so liberally, as to give oddes, undertaking to bring not only expresse formall examples, but also an expresse command in formall termes, these are your words. I pray you tell me, is not that 1 Cor 11. 28. *ἑκαστος ἑαυτὸν ἐξετάστω*, Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup, an expresse command, in formall termes, and doth not *ἑκαστος* comprehend both sexes? If this be an expresse command in formall termes for womens receiving the Sacrament of the Lords Supper (which I beleieve no man but Mr. Blackwood had thought) then are we furnished with an expresse command, in termes as formall, and with an example to boote, of womens Circumcision, and so the difference between Circumcision and Baptisme (so often layed in the dish of Pedobaptists) here falls to the ground; yee on the Sabbath day Circumcise *ἑκαστον* a man. John 7. 22. if *ἑκαστος* a man on the Sabbath day receive Circumcision, that the Law of Moses should not be broken, John 7. 23. Here is Moses his command, and the Jewes practice with Christs approbation in the same comprehensive latitude; in regard of both sexes, as in Saint Paul for receiving of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper; and if arguments borrowed from Grammar-use of words be of that force, you see what you have proved, as *ἑκαστος* is taken in one Sacrament, in the same sense it is to be taken in another; but in the Sacrament of Circumcision it's limited to the male only, to which accords that Logick-rule, *omne analogum stans per se stat pro famosiori analogato*, Therefore in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, it is to be limited to males also: you come to examples, when he saith, 1 Cor. 10. 17. *We being many are one bread, and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread, and are not Women as well of the body as men?* and if so, here is an expresse example in formall termes for womens receiving the Lords Supper. You do not tell us what you mean by body in this place, whether body mysticall, as members of Christ, or Ecclesiasticall as members of Christian Churches, it is the body Ecclesiasticall that is there meant,

meant, as might be demonstrated: many answers might be given to serve your turn, 1. Women may be of the body without the Sacrament, as they were of the body of Israel, and called Circumcision, being uncircumcised. 2. The word all (which some times you can limit at pleasure) may be understood according to the first institution, where there were only men, or all of those that had wrote to him about this businesse of Idols, amongst which there is little probability that there were any women. 3. Take it at the best, the example is not expresse, but by consequence only. Is it said that women, or any particular woman did communicate? You are put in an argumentative way, to make proof that all that are of the body partake of the bread; but women are of the body, *Ergo, &c.* But having a fourth answer, which, I am sure will give you satisfaction, that I will rest in. You remember your owne interpretation of those words brought in by Master Marshall, *The whole house of Israel is circumcised in the flesh. The sense is not (you say) page 38. every person is either actually or virtually circumcised, but all the house of Israel is put for a great part, or the greater, or the most eminent, as it is frequently else-where, 1 Sam. 7. 3. Acts 2. 36. Acts 13. 24. as the whole Church is said to come together, when the most of them come together; and in the like manner the people of the Jewes may be called the Circumcision, from the greater or more famous part, though the women be neither actually nor virtually circumcised.* If that place brought by Mr. Marshall be no proof, no not so much as by consequence that women were virtually circumcised, much lesse is this a proof expresse, that they actually received the Lords Supper. Yea Mr. Marshalls argument holds (women had all the benefit which males received in Circumcision) and yours fals, when you would make this text an expresse example for womens receiving the Lords Supper. Yet this was brought to your people in *Gabriel-Fen-Church*, as an example expresse and formall, and Mr. Vines and my self (neighbour City Ministers) made famous with a pulpit-quotation, as men denying it: must not Scripture sense be now one, and then another, just as it will serve your purpose? *The like (you say) may be said of 1 Cor. 12. 13. and I say it may receive the like answer, and if by body, any understand not the body mysticall but Ecclesiasticall in this last place, as seems to be the meaning, then here is an example for Infants Baptisme.* You dare not deny them to be of the body mysticall, though you will not have them to be of the body Ecclesiasticall, and thus I reason; They that are of this one body are baptized into this body; but Infants as well as women, are of this body, *Ergo, &c.* You bring a third example in formall termes for womens receiving of the Lords Supper, *Acts 20. 7.* Where it is said, *when the Disciples came*

came together on the first day of the week to break bread. But first you should have made your Reader clear in this, that *breaking of bread* is there meant of the Lords Supper, which you know many doubt, and I professe my self unsatisfied, though those of your opinion (quitting the name of the Lords Supper) call it only breaking of bread. Calvin indeed supposes this text in the *Acts* to be meant of the Lords Supper, but those other places, *Luke* 24. 30. and 35. *Acts* 2. 42. he understands only of ordinary food; but I see no reason to understand those places of common, and this of Sacramentall bread. You know the use that Popish Interpreters make of these places, to maintaine a Sacrament in one kinde only; and indeed taking these texts to be meant of the Lords Supper, I know not well how to avoid their argument. If you say the words are Synecdochicall, one kinde is named, and both are understood; that of our Saviour (*Math. 26. 29. I will not drinke henceforth of this fruit of the Vine, untill that day that I drinke it new with you in my Fathers Kingdome*) seems to contradict it. But if it should be granted that the text is meant of the Lords Supper, yet how will you make up a formall example out of it? Must it not be in this manner? Disciples met, and therefore women? which cannot otherwise be made good, but in affirming that all that are Disciples are women; and he were a weak man that would not deny this proposition. Yea women might meet for other Ordinances sake at a meeting of breaking of bread, though they did not communicate. You here prevent an objection, which it seems you did fore-see, *unlesse* (say you) *you will say that εαυτῶν, πάντων, ἁνδρῶν*, himself, all Disciples, comprehend not women because they are of the Masculine gender, which from you that have learned that *Logica non curat sexum*, Logick regards not sexe, I do not suspect. Your Logick I confesse, is a sufficient proof of a possibility, that females might be there, notwithstanding the Masculine gender there used; and I beleve you had never heard of the objection, if you your self had not framed it. But it lies upon you to bring an expresse proof that females were there, and that any Logick can conclude this from the use of the Masculine gender, or any thing else that in the text may be found; I suppose Master Marshall and Master Vines are (I am sure I am) ignorant: let me adventure upon instance of frequent examples, daily examples, farre more formall and expresse then these by you named, of Infant-baptisme in the Primitive times. The Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved, *Acts* 2. 47. Infants are saved as well as those of grown yeeres (as your words confesse, though your grounds over-throw) Infants therefore are to be baptized; if you, or any other except against the Syllogisme



baptisme that it hath that in the conclusion which is not in the premises, and that the addition to the Church was not by Baptisme, I shall maintain that there was no other way of addition.

## CHAP. X.

*The Doctrine of Covenant-holinesse derived from parents to children more ancient then the dayes of Zwinglius, being taught as by Peter, Paul, so also by Tertullian, Hierome, &c. that Jesuits were the first opposers.*

Section 13. you examine that text, *Matth. 28. 19.* and deny it to be any command, for the baptizing of Infants, and presently on your instance upon it, you say, *It is no wrong to say that it is a new Gospel to affirme that this is one of the promises of the Covenant of grace, that God will be the God of beleivers, and of their seed: and that the seed of beleivers are taken into Covenant with their parents.* If to affirme this be not only an error, but a new Gospel, then it is another Gospel from that which Paul preached, and which *Rom. 1. 2, 3.* he defines. Then those that preach it, are such, that with the false teachers in *Galatia*, pervert the Gospel of Christ, *Gal. 1.* Then they are accursed, whosoever they be that preach it, *Gal. 1.* A very high charge from that mouth which very lately preached it as a Gospel truth; and now (being suddenly otherwise perswaded) can bring no other arguments then those that are borrowed from Antichristian Sectaries, who are confessed subverters of the Gospel; you come in with your reason, why it is no wrong to say what you have spoken. *I can derive its pedigree (you say) no higher then Zwinglius.* But Heralds as learned as your self, can fetch it as high as *Abraham*, and derive it along by severall descents, to *David*, and down along to the dayes of the Apostles, continuing as long as the Jewes continued a visible Church. They can again finde it in *Peters* first Sermon, after the holy Ghost was given, as also in *Saint Pauls* doctrine, *Rom. 11. 16. 1 Cor. 7. 14.* That Covenant to be the God of beleivers and their seed Circumcision did seale, *Gen. 17. 7. 10.* And Circumcision was a seale of the righteousness of faith, *Rom. 4. 11.* which is no other then a Covenant of grace. And therefore when the Saints begge grace, and plead for mercy at the hands

hands of God, they urge this Covenant, *Exod. 32. 13. Dent. 9. 27.* And God himselfe when he promiseth a mercy, promiseth to remember this Covenant, *Levit. 26. 42.* What stay could this be to *Moses* his faith, when God appeared to him in the bush, and said, *I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaach, and the God of Jacob, Exod. 3. 6.* If that promise were no promise of grace or mercy to his posterity? If any say that it was a promise of the possession of the Land of *Canaan*, and the multiplication of *Abrahams* posterity; I may answer with *Chamier, lib. 5. de Bapt. Agnoscatur annexi promissionem terra Canaan, &c.* Let it be granted that the promise of the Land of *Canaan* is annexed to this Covenant, yet (saith he) this is not the Covenant, but an appendant to it, as unto godlinesse the promises of this life are annexed. I further answer, that it is such a promise, that the beliefe of it, and faith in it was the justification of *Abraham*, as may be seen *Gen. 15. 5, 6. Rom. 4. 3.* It was a promise or Covenant that contained in it the great mystery of mans redemption, as is plaine, comparing that other of God to *Abraham* confirming it, *Gen. 22. 16.* and the comment of *Zachary*, the father of *John Baptist* upon it, *Luke 1. 73.* It contained a promise of resurrection to glory, as is evident comparing the words of God himselfe to *Moses, Exod. 3. 6.* and *Christ*s words to the Sadduces, *Matth. 22. 32.* I shall passe by those Scriptures named, which are in controversie (though it be your manner to take them for granted, to speak on your side, when they are most evident against you) and come to some Authors that are *Zwinnius* his seniors. *Tertullian* was nigh 1300 yeeres before him, and this was his doctrine from *1 Cor. 7. 14.* in his Book *De Anima, cap. 39. Hinc enim, Apostolus ait, ex sanctificato alterutro sexu sancti procreari, tam ex seminis prerogativa, quam ex institutionis disciplina.* From either sexe sanctified, the Apostle saith, that holy children are born as well by birth-priviledge, as nurture of education. And I marvell, that when you wrote, you could be ignorant of this in *Tertullian*, quoting (in this Letter of yours) the very chapter where these words are, which is not a chapter of many lines; you may finde it quoted in *Vossius* his Theses *De Pado-Baptismo, pars secunda, Thes. 11.* And put into the title page of my Defence of the Birth-priviledge. And *Hierome* writing to *Paulinus, Epist. 153.* in satisfaction of severall questions, of which this was one, to know the meaning of those words in the Apostle (*Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy*) hath these words, *De secunda problemati tuo Tertullianus in libris de*

monogamia differuit, asserens sanctos dici fidelium filios, quod quasi candidati sunt fidei & nullis idololatriæ sordibus polluantur. His meaning is plaine, that the seed of beleevers (having no taint of Idolatry by descent from Idolaters, so as to be reckoned in the number of Idolaters and unclean, but designed for the faith of Christ, and accounted of that number) are therefore by the Apostle counted holy. It followes also in the place formerly quoted out of *Tertullian de anima*, (which *Estius* thinks, though with better probability, to be the same place which *Hierome* cites) *Ceterum immundi nascerentur, quasi designatos tamen sanctitatis, ac per hoc etiam salutis, intelligi volens fidelium filios: ut hujus spei pignora matrimoniis, qua retinenda censuerat, patrocinarentur.* Else (saith he) (Were it not for this birth-priviledge) they were borne unclean; yet, the Apostle willing to have the children of beleevers to be known to be as designed for holinesse, and so for salvation, that these pledges of hope might patronize those marriages which he determined should be continued. The Infants of beleevers are by the Apostle called holy, according to *Tertullian*, because *Candidati fidei, designati salutis*, and that by birth-priviledge, and so delivered from all blot of Idolatry by descent. And *Erasmus* (whom *Bellarmino* takes to strike obliquely at the Baptisme of Infants, *De Baptis. cap. 8.*) in his glosse upon *Hierom.*, hath these words, *Candidati hic substantivum est nomen, significatque eos, qui honorem aliquem ambiunt, ut olim candidati prætores dicebantur, qui praturam peterent, ergo qui nascuntur ex Christianis sancti vocantur, & ante Baptismum, quod velut ambiunt & expectant Baptismum.* All this is enough to shew (as the title of birth-priviledge, so) their right of enrollment among beleevers and holy, and not among idolatrous and unclean ones. *Hierom* having given to *Paulinus Tertullians* judgement, in brieffe addes his owne; *Simulque considera, quod & vasa sacra, in tabernaculo legimus, & cetera quæ ad ritum ceremoniarum pertinent: cum utique sancta esse non possunt, nisi ea quæ sentiunt, & venerantur Deum,* and afterwards in the same Epistle he addes, *Ipsium templum sanctuarii nominatur.* A holinesse of dedication and consecration unto God (according to *Hierom*) was in those vessels and in the Temple it self, according to Gods appointment, though not an inherent holinesse. And so it is (in his judgement) with the children of beleevers. All those that make Baptisme the heire and successor of Circumcision, to follow in the roome, and stead of it, are of the same mind concerning this Covenant-holinesse, or New Gospel as you terme it.



But that peece of Gospel, as you heard before, *Iustin Martyr* and *Epiphanius* did preach, as also *Austin*, *Isidorus Pelusota*, as you may see in *Chamier de Sacra. in genere*, lib. 2. I doubt not but farre more might bee spoke out of antiquity against this, which you so often harp upon, that the doctrine of Covenant-holinesse is no elder then *Zwinglius*, by those that have what I want, strength of body, leisure, and provision of Books, for a full search. But this, I suppose, may serve to show how much you are mistaken. And if none spoke so fully of it before *Zwinglius*, it is nothing strange, you well know how timely the opinion of the necessity of Baptisme to salvation, and the certainty of taking away sinne by the work done, came into the Church, which made those Fathers and following Writers (who over-hastily swallowed this tenent) to urge regeneration in, and washing away of sinne by Baptisme, rather then any precedent right, in which the persons to be baptized were interested, or which Baptisme did seale or assure. Now *Zwinglius* was one of the first that did discover these corruptions in this doctrine, and though he seemed to go too much on the other hand, and not to give the due right unto the Sacraments, but to make them meer badges of outward profession; which yet *Peter Martyr*, that lived a neerer distance, doth excuse, *Loc. com. class. 4. cap. 10.* Yet on this hand hee went right, in which *Luther* his contemporary and opposite in this thing is charged to be defective: If then he brought to light this ancient doctrine of Fedrall or Covenant-holinesse more cleerly then the Writers of some ages before him, as *Luther* most happily the doctrine of Justification by Faith, we have no more cause of quarrell or cavill at one, then the other: hee took out of the way the false grounds of Baptisme (whether of Infants or men of yeeres) and set it on that bottom: on which it stands by Scripture warrant. If you over-throw an outward Covenant (as I may call it) which is the priviledge of a Church visible, and bring instead of it only the inward work, or grace covenanted, then all administration of Sacraments (whether Baptisme or the Lords Supper) ceases, seeing the persons interested cannot bee (by any employed in administration) discerned or distinguished. You go on, page 127. descanting on Master *Marshall* words, as doubting what sence they may carry, where he saith, *Every Nation which should receive the faith, should be to him now, as the peculiar Nation of the Jewes had beene in times past*, seemingly taking much paines to hunt out his meaning; but purposely,

after

after your manner, concealing that which you know (and every man of common sense) knows is his meaning. You would willingly bear men in hand, that his meaning is; *When a Nation shall receive the faith, that is, a great or eminent part, the Governours and chief Cities, and representative body shall receive the faith, that Nation shall in like manner have all their little ones capable of Baptisme, and counted visible members of the Church as the posterity of the Jewes were in the time of that Church-administration.* This (you say) you guesse is the businessse that is now upon the Anvill, by observing sundry passages in later Writers, with Whom Master Marshalls Sermon agrees, as if it came out of the same Forge. I cannot tell in what Forge you can finde this businessse, except it be in your owne braine; there sure it was hatched; for you are the alone man, from whom I ever heard of it. Master Blake (you say) page 20. hath these words in the same sense and latitude as Nation was taken, in respect of the Covenant of God, when the Covenant, and Covenant initiating Sacrament was restrained to that one only Nation, where there commission was first limited, in the same sense it is to be taken (unlesse the Text expresse the contrary) now this commission is enlarged. This cannot be denied of any that will have the Apostles able to know Christs meaning by his words in this enlarged commission. But Nation then, as is confessed, did comprehend all in the Nation, in respect of the Covenant, and nothing is expressed in the Text to the contrary; therefore it is to be taken in that latitude, to comprehend Infants. Master Rutherford in his peaceable and temperate plea, Ch. 12. Concl. 1. Arg. 7. hath these words: seeing God hath chosen the race and Nation of the Gentiles, and is become a God to us and to our seed; the seed must be holy with holinesse of the chosen Nation, and holinesse externall of the Covenant, notwithstanding the father and mother were as wicked as the Jewes, who slew the Lord of glory. In which of these words I pray you, can you finde one word of that businessse, which you say is on the Anvill, that when a Nation shall receive the faith, that is a great and eminent part, &c? Do we expresse any one such passage? Were not you in a dreame, when this fell from your pen? You go on, and say, and indeed those Pedobaptists are forced to say so, who justifie the practice of baptizing foundlings, Infants of Papists, excommunicate persons, Apostates, if they be borne within their parishes, thereby directly crossing their owne tenent. That this is the priviledge of a beleever from the Covenant of grace, I will

be the God of a beleever, and his seed: and the Apostles words, 1 Cor. 7. 14. according to their owne exposition, which is, that the children whereof one of the parents is not sanctified by the faith of the other, are federally unclean. If you take the words [Beleever] and [Covenant of grace] as respective to interest in Ordinances out of the Scripture sense, and only in your owne acception limited to a faith justifying, and the mercy promised in the Covenant, then I confesse it crosseth it; but that is your owne tenent, and not your adversaries; and how I pray you doth it crosse the 1 Corin. 7. 14. according to our owne exposition; seeing every one that is a Christian *nomine tenus*, that is, not a professed Infidell, is with us as with the Apostle in that Text a beleever and sanctified, for the bringing forth of an holy seed? The Corinthians had no scruple about continuance of marriage society with professed Christians of an unholy life; but professed Infidels. All not Infidels are there beleiving ones. For the baptizing of foundlings, it is not to be justified, where there is any morall possibility of their descent from any other but those that bare the name of Christians; and so in the Apostles language are the seed of beleivers, unlesse we do beleieve aright in the children adopted by Christians, and baptized upon their adopting parents, undertaking their education, which tenent being controverted, I will not now examine: he that pleaseth may read it disputed in *Rivers Exercitations* on Gen. 17. You go on, *Nor considering that this practise of baptizing all in the parish, arose not from any conceit of the federall holinesse of a Nation, but from the conceit of Cyprian, with his 66. Bishops, that the grace of God is to be denied to none that are borne of men.* It is very like that we that cannot beleieve it, do not much consider it; the doctrine of Covenant-holinesse, transferred from parents to children, Cyprian either did, or might have learned from Tertullian, whom he used to call his Master. For those words of Cyprian and his Bishops, they do not oppose, but imply a federall holinesse, and it is such a conceit, to which I subscribe, *that the grace of God is to be denied to none that are borne of men.* It is not his grace unlesse he vouchsafe a grant of it, and when God hath granted it, no man may be denied it. You proceed, *upon which ground, and the necessity of Baptisme to save a child from perishing, as of old, so still among the common people, and officiating Priests, children are baptized without any relation to Covenant-holinesse.*



lineſſe, particular or nationall. It were worth inquiry to learne whom you meane by officiating Priests; it well ſuits with your language in ſome other places of your Book, and the common cuſtome of many of your judgement, to ſtile all that performe the office of Infant-baptiſme by that name; whom ſoever you meane, your argument is of little weight, becauſe ſome do it upon unwarrantable grounds (as they alſo make their prayers) therefore all praſtiſe of it is unwarrantable. But (you ſay) you leave this to the Independents to agitate, who have in this point the advantage. And no ſmall advantage (I ſuppoſe) you conceit, ſo many of them as oppoſe Covenant-holineſſe, in that they have got you of their party, that otherwiſe are their adverſary; yet Independents (for ought I know) have not much appeared againſt this doctrine. In all your diſcourſe you mention but one; and him you quote not from the Preſſe, but only from the Pulpit, in which perhaps many of his party may leave him: your friend of the Aſſembly (I am ſure) told me that M. Thomas Goodwins freinds there, in this thing were againſt him; but howſoever, I wonder that you do not rather leave it to the Jeſuits then to the Independents to agitate, ſeeing they were before both you and them in the oppoſition of this doctrine. If the Proverb would have us to give the Devill his due, why then ſhould we deny it to thoſe that have done him ſo much ſervice? Your ſelfe were well aware, that every weapon that you liſt up againſt this Proteſtant doctrine was forged on their Anvill, and that in the whole conflict you were neceſſitated to borrow help from the Philistine Artiſts when you were put upon it, to ſay page 113. *This is no undeniable Axiome, that, what all the Proteſtant Divines defend againſt the Papiſts, muſt be truth undeniable,* I do not know (help me if you can in all your reading) one Proteſtant writer that hath declared himſelfe in this thing, but hath declared himſelf to bee your adverſary: nor one Jeſuite or Popiſh writer (*Salmeron* excepted, who in this point, as alſo *Pighius* in the point of juſtification, came over to *Calvin*) but in this thing is for you; neither can I meeete with one argument in Maſter *Blackwoods* and your papers againſt federall holineſſe, which may not bee found in *Bellarmino*, *Stapleton*, *A lapide*, the *Rhemists*, or ſome of that party. You and I have:

be the God of a beleever, and his seed: and the Apostles words, 1 Cor. 7. 14. according to their owne exposition, which is, that the children whereof one of the parents is not sanctified by the faith of the other, are federally unclean. If you take the words [Beleever] and [Covenant of grace] as respective to interest in Ordinances out of the Scripture sense, and only in your owne acception limited to a faith justifying, and the mercy promised in the Covenant, then I confesse it crosseth it; but that is your owne tenent, and not your adversaries; and how I pray you doth it crosse the 1 Corin. 7. 14. according to our owne exposition; seeing every one that is a Christian *nomine tenus*, that is, not a professed Infidell, is with us as with the Apostle in that Text a beleever and sanctified, for the bringing forth of an holy seed? The Corinthians had no scruple about continuance of marriage society with professed Christians of an unholy life; but professed Infidels. All not Infidels are there beleiving ones. For the baptizing of foundlings, it is not to be justified, where there is any morall possibility of their descent from any other but those that bare the name of Christians; and so in the Apostles language are the seed of beleivers, unlesse we do beleieve aright in the children adopted by Christians, and baptized upon their adopting parents, undertaking their education, which tenent being controverted, I will not now examine: he that pleaseth may read it disputed in *Rivets Exercitations* on Gen. 17. You go on, *Nor considering that this practise of baptizing all in the parish, arose not from any conceit of the federall holinesse of a Nation, but from the conceit of Cyprian, with his 66. Bishops, that the grace of God is to be denied to none that are borne of men.* It is very like that we that cannot beleieve it, do not much consider it; the doctrine of Covenant-holinesse, transferred from parents to children, Cyprian either did, or might have learned from Tertullian, whom he used to call his Master. For those words of Cyprian and his Bishops, they do not oppose, but imply a federall holinesse, and it is such a conceit, to which I subscribe, *that the grace of God is to be denied to none that are borne of men.* It is not his grace unlesse he vouchsafe a grant of it, and when God hath granted it, no man may be denied it. You proceed, *upon which ground, and the necessity of Baptisme to save a child from perishing, as of old, so still among the common people, and officiating Priests, children are baptized without any relation to Covenant-holinesse.*

linesse, particular or nationall. It were worth inquiry to learne whom you meane by officiating Priests, it well suits with your language in some other places of your Book, and the common custome of many of your judgement, to stile all that performe the office of Infant-baptisme by that name; whom soever you meane, your argument is of little weight, because some do it upon unwarrantable grounds (as they also make their prayers) therefore all practise of it is unwarrantable. But (you say) you leave this to the Independents to agitate, who have in this point the advantage. And no small advantage (I suppose) you conceit, so many of them as oppose Covenant-holinesse, in that they have got you of their party, that otherwise are their adversary; yet Independents (for ought I know) have not much appeared against this doctrine. In all your discourse you mention but one; and him you quote not from the Presse, but only from the Pulpit, in which perhaps many of his party may leave him: your friend of the Assembly (I am sure) told me that M. Thomas Goodwins freinds there, in this thing were against him; but howsoever, I wonder that you do not rather leave it to the Jesuits then to the Independents to agitate, seeing they were before both you and them in the opposition of this doctrine. If the Proverb would have us to give the Devill his due, why then should we deny it to those that have done him so much service? Your selfe were well aware, that every weapon that you lift up against this Protestant doctrine was forged on their Anvill, and that in the whole conflict you were necessitated to borrow help from the Philistine Artists when you were put upon it, to say page 113. *This is no undeniable Axiome, that, what all the Protestant Divines defend against the Papists, must be truth undeniable,* I do not know (help me if you can in all your reading) one Protestant writer that hath declared himselfe in this thing, but hath declared himself to bee your adversary: nor one Jesuite or Popish writer (*Salmeron* excepted, who in this point, as also *Pighius* in the point of justification, came over to *Calvin*) but in this thing is for you; neither can I meete with one argument in Master *Blackwoods* and your papers against federall holinesse, which may not bee found in *Bellarmino*, *Stapleton*, *A lapide*, the *Rhemists*, or some of that party. You and I have:



have entred Covenant to the extirpation of Popery; and I would learn of you by what character or marke it may be now discerned; all the doctrine that Papists teach (all confesse) is not Popery; but that which they teach in opposition to Protestant Doctrine, and the concurrent judgement of Protestant Divines, is wont to have that brand; but now wee shall be to seek by what note or marke wee may know it. You thinke you have the suffrage of the Church of England for you in this censure of Protestants, Art. 21. Where it is said, *that Generall Councils have erred, and may erre, and consequently* (you say) *all the Divines in the world.* But that is no good consequence; a Generall Councell may erre, and a considerable part of it may hold the truth, and a greater number then the whole Councell in the world may bee in the truth likewise; and let me further aske you whether Orthodox Generall Conneels gathered against the worst of Hereticks, may conclude an error *nomine contradicente*? and the Hereticks hold fast the truth in opposition against them: May we not require one other instance of a Popish truth, standing up against an Orthodox error besides this in controversie? Scripture telleth us of the Whores Cup of Fornication, making drunk the Kings and inhabitants of the earth: it is strange that there is no one word of prophesie of this single truth as one ingredient in it.

## CHAP. XL Sect. I.

*Concerning the Grammaticall construction of those words, Go teach all Nations, baptizing them.*

Page 124. You returne (you say) to the Text, *Matth. 28. 19.* Concerning which you put the question, *what αὐτοῖς, or [them] refers to in our Saviours words, whether all Nations must be the substantive to it without any other circumscription, or the word ἀδελφοί, men and women, or μαθηταί Disciples included in the verb μαθητεύετε, which may be translated make Disciples, and presently upon it, you fall to examine passages in two Books,*  
com-

comparing *Psal.* 76. 1, 2. with *Mal.* 1. 11. It were easie to heap up Scri-  
a declaration against Anabaptists. I know not the men, nor the  
Books, and therefore they must speak for themselves. If you  
render their words and sense aright in many things, I am of  
your mind against them; namely, that to discipline is not barely to  
teach without any further fruit of their teaching, and that dis-  
cipling Nations was not by baptizing. In the close of which di-  
spite of yours with them, you give us the result of all, and tell  
us, that it tends to this, to prove, that when Christ saith, teach  
all Nations and Baptize them, his meaning is, by preaching the  
Gospel to all Nations, make them Disciples, and Baptize those that  
do become disciples of all Nations. To which interpretation, as in  
words you there lay it downe, I am ready to subscribe; but I  
doubt you scarce meane what you say, the conclusion being far  
more found then the premises on which it is built. When you  
say by preaching the Gospel to all Nations to make them Disciples,  
I beleeve you do not speak of Nations properly, but Synecdoch-  
ically, some part of the Nation, which agrees with your Gram-  
mar construction before delivered, page 126. that ἀὐτοῖς; [them] re-  
ferres both to μαθητὰς Disciples, and to ἔθνη Nations thus μαθητὰς ἐν  
ἑστέον τοῖς ἔθνεσιν Disciples of all Nations, and must be thus expounded  
make Disciples of all Nations Baptizing them. To make Nations Dis-  
ciples, and to make Disciples out of all Nations, are farre different  
things. In which construction I cannot but wonder at your boldnesse.  
Is not the Verb μαθητεύετε transitive? is not the case in the Noun  
ἔθνη Accusative? as the Number is plurall, and the Epithite παντα uni-  
versall. Whence had you warrant so to insert a Noun, as to change  
the case from Accusative to Genitive, and so instead of Nations to un-  
derstand as many or as few as you list of Nations, cleane against the  
sense of Scripture? which plainly is, that the whole of the Nation  
where they came, was in their commission to disciple; let us there-  
fore compare Scripture propheties with this commission given in  
charge by Christ Jesus. *Deut.* 32. 9. Moses saith, the Lords portion is  
his people, Jacob is the lot of his inheritance; that is, as you know the  
whole seed of Jacob, and the promise to Christ concerning the Hea-  
then, is of like extent, *Psal.* 2. 8. Aske of me, and I shall give thee the  
Heathen for thine inheritance, &c. The Heathen, not some among the  
Heathen, as before Jacob, not some of Jacob; the like we may finde,  
one

one of *Infants baptizing* proved lawfull by *Scripture*, the other pture propheties for this purpose, *Psal. 72. 11. Psal. 86. 9.* what the spirit of God hath thus foretold, that the Apostles now have in commission to begin to work, and in succession of time must be effected, when the Kingdomes of the earth shall become the Kingdomes of our Lord and of his Christ, *Revel. 11. 15.* In *Europe*, to look to no other parts of the world, it hath happily been effected, though the work (by the working of that man of sin for the present) be much obscured. If you think to evade this by that distinction of the Apostle, *Rom. 9. 6.* In quotation of which you are very frequent, *They are not all Israel, which are of Israel.* That distinction can be no otherwise applicable to Christian Nations, then to the Nation of Israel, and so it will still entitle Christian Nations to the Covenant of God and priviledge of Ordinances of Israel, notwithstanding that distinction, willingly yeelding that among these Disciples who are all called ones, there are many that are not chosen, and confessing that that which you would make to be the whole meaning of Christs words in this commission (*make Disciples of all Nations baptizing them, that is the Disciples of all Nations*) is included in the meaning, they have the whole of the Nation in their commission, and it must be their endeavour (in the uttermost extent of the word) to disciple it, yet this work in no one Nation can be done in an instant; as a Nation cannot be born, so neither can it be in a day disciplined: the nature of the work, and practice of the Church in all ages, show that it must be done piece-meale. *Alexander* had it in his thoughts to make conquest of the world of all Nations in the world; yet this could not be done at one stroke, nor in one battell; he must take Nation after Nation, and City after City in the same Nation. The like is the businesse of the Apostles, and of Ministers in all succeeding ages, imployed in Nations strangers to Christ Jesus: so that I conclude the meaning is to disciple Nations, that is, the whole of the Nation, and being disciplined to baptize them, yet by degrees to baptize, as they can disciple, till the whole of the Nation be disciplined and baptized.



§ 2. What Infants are of right to be baptized, Padobaptists have a rule to discern it Anti-padobaptists can finde no rule corresponding to their principles for Baptisme of grown persons,

pag. 127. You fall upon examination of a position (which you say after Mr. Blake & M. Rusherford, M. Marshall seems to embrace) concerning the federall or externall holinesse of a believing or chosen Nation giving right to the Infants of that Nation to be baptized. About which the question is, whether there be any such federall holinesse of or in a believing nation, giving right to Infants in that Nation to be baptized. Concerning which you ask leave to argue a little, but you take leave to argue more then a little, but if your meaning be to argue little to the purpose, I confesse it is very litle. I had thought no man had equalled Bellarmine, in taking pains to find a root in a Bulrush. In his interpretation of that text, *Matth. 26. 27.* Drink ye all of this, whatsoever Protestants can understand by all, he supposeth he hath his exceptions, so as to take off that text from giving any right of the Cup in the Sacrament to the Layty. *De Sacra. Eucharist. lib. 4. cap. 25.* but here I confesse, you have out-gone him, and it is as hard a taske to defend the right of people to the Cup in the Sacrament against all his evasions, as the right of Infants to Baptisme against all your Queres: Let us heare therefore what you say: First (you say) if Infants may be baptized, because they are born in a chosen Nation, or a believing Nation, then there may be a rule whereby we may know, when a Nation may be called a believing or chosen Nation; when not; otherwise wee should not know when to make use of this title to Baptisme, when not; but no rule can be assigned whereby to know when a Nation is a believing, chosen, or disciplined Nation giving right to baptize Infants of that Nation, when not. Do you mean rules to clear and plain, that no difficulty or case of conscience can occurre, that needs inquiry in observation of it, then I shall deny your sequell; there may be a rule, yet not so clear to every understanding, that all should be without scruple at all times, in every case, that happens about it; if this hold, farewell all Church-discipline, Church-censures, Sabbath-rest and administration of Sacraments. We have a rule for the use of our liberty in things indifferent, and yet you have been put to it, to answer scruples about it. Your minor proposition I wholly deny, and do not doubt but to make good a rule, whereby we may discern an Infants right to Baptisme, and the whole of the argument I may hereafter make use of, and if it doth not more presse and pinch you then me in the interpretation of Christs Commission, let the truth be concluded in this thing to be against me. You make an assay, by induction of particulars, to prove

that there is no such rule. If it be said, they may be known, in that they are descended from such a believer as *Abraham*. Here perhaps? we may have a rule if we look no further, descent is two-fold, first legall, secondly, naturall. When a Nation is legally descended from *Abraham*, that is, is interested by Gods free donation in the privileges of *Abraham*, equalled in privileges with *Abraham*, and his seed, the Infants in such a Nation are to be baptized: when a Nation are not Infidels, but Christians; then their children are holy, and to be enrolled in the society and fellowship of the Saints. To this you reply, then God would have left us a note, to know such a Nation by as he did *Abrahams* posterity by circumcision: But there is no such note, &c. The profession of the faith of *Abraham* is a note to discern such a man, such a Nation that is thus descended from *Abraham*, and Baptism it self is as good a note, as that which you instance of Circumcision, & as good a character of a Christian as Circumcision of an Israelite. All that were circumcised did not by naturall descent come out of *Abrahams* loynes. You go on, If it be said when the King of a Countrey is a believer; and against this you have your exception. And if it be said, the Nation is a believing Nation, when the representative body believes, and so the children of that people may be baptized, against this you have your exceptions: the representative body may be believers, and the greatest part Infidels, Papists, &c. And here I am brought in. Therefore (you say) if Mr. Blakes argument be good: The Infants of any Nation make up a part of the Nation. and the Nation where they came, was to be discipled and therefore the Infants to be baptized: the same reason holds (you say) for Infidels of age, for they are a part of the Nation. This is no argument of Mr. Blakes but of Mr. Tombes, and seeing you are so full of your Poetry; may not I apply that of the Epigrammatist, *Tu male dum repetas*, &c. It is true, that I say, The Infants of any Nation make up a part of the Nation, and the Nation, where the Apostles or their successors in that work came, was to be discipled: But the inference, and therefore the Infants to be baptized are no words of mine, though put in a distinct character, but an addition of your own, as any may see. *Brib privilege*, pag. 20. If you say, that though they be not my words yet they were my meaning, being brought in upon occasion of this dispute of Infants Baptisme, I answer, that I best know my own meaning. If you had added, and the Nation being discipled; then Infants as part of the Nation, are to be baptized, then though you had missed my words, yet you had hit of my meaning, but then your reason would come to nothing where you say, the same reason holds for Infidels of age, for they are part of the Nation. It holds indeed of Infidels of age discipled, that with others of the Nation, they are to be baptized:

red sit is not of their being of the Nation, but their being discipled with others of the Nation, that gives them right to Baptisme. You proceed. *If it be said, it is a believing Nation when the greatest part are believers.* Against this you have your pretty exception: must the Minister stay, till they be counted by poll, as the Sheriffs do at the election of Knights of the Shire? You go on, *If it be said, when all adults of ripe years are believers,* I shall returne you a direct answer, when a King of any Countrey is a believer, then that King and his children are to be baptized; his children and not his subjects are his seed. When the representative body of a Kingdom are believers, then those that make up that body, and their children are to be baptized. If the major part of a Nation be believers, then that major part and their children are to be baptized. If all that are of ripe years be believers, Then all those and their children are to be baptized: We take Nation, *conjunctim & divisim*; for the whole of the Nation, or any perticular members of the Nation. The Nation wee say, according to Christs Commission, is to be discipled, which, as I said, is not done at once, but by degrees: and as they are discipled, so they must be baptized. All this vain labour therefore might have been spared, seeing you very well know, that this is our meaning. The Infants of *Corinth* were to be baptized as holy, when the least part of that Region of *Achaia* were believers. They are baptized by vertue of a priviledge from their parents, not from the Nation. Though, when the Nation is wholly Christian, the faith of the parent is then the faith of the Nation. To this last you say, *Then such a right is asserted as never was, nor perhaps ever will be, till all Israel be saved.* In which reply, you seeme very bold, both with Christs Commission and the propheties of the Spirit of God in the holy Scriptures: Christ gives in Commission to disciple Nations: Hee foretels, that all Nations shall serve him, That the Kingdomes of the earth shall be the Lords and his Christs. And you might as well say, this shall be made good in any one Nation, *Ad Grecas calendas*, for that salvation of all *Israel* of which you speak from *Rom. 11. 26.* I know not what you look for, I look for no other, then such as the Gentile Nations converted now enjoy, then *England* by Gods mercie doth enjoy in a degree (indeed I believe) more glorious. But no salvation of any other kinde, Christ once said, *Salvation is of the Jews, Joh. 4. 22.* And then it shall be said, salvation is of both Jews and Gentiles, and so the late Annotations on the Bible expound it: *The body of this people in generall shall be brought again into a way of salvation, and re-established into the Church of the whole Israel of God, consisting of Jews and Gentiles.* You goe on saying, *Secondly, But if it could be resolved, what number or sort of believers make a believing Na-*



tion, giving title to Infam-baptisme; yet there would be uncertainty concerning the kinde of believing, which might denominate a believing or chosen Nation, having federall or externall holinesse, such as may create title to the baptisme of infants of that Nation. There are some Nations which are reckoned among believers, which yet are misbelievers, as Hereticks, for instance, the Nation of the Goths, who were Arrians, or grossly idolatrous; as the Spaniards, shall they give title to their children to baptisme; when without repentance they cannot be deemed capable of communion in the body of Christ. Here you seem to confesse, that the holding of the doctrine of faith is sufficient to denominate a Christian, and to make a man or a Nation believing; and there is no greater uncertainty, what faith in the parent shall entitle the childe; then there is what faith shall entitle the parents themselves to baptisme: this objection is of equall strength against your selfe as against Pædobaptists, if you allow any kinde of baptisme, for the Goths who were Arrians, they were also converted by Arrians; they that converted them, would doubtlesse, baptize them. The Spaniards are no Nation newly discipled to be baptized, but a Nation long since Christianized; and in the purity of profession degenerate, they have not lost all doctrine of faith, nor yet their baptisme: It is but little to the purpose to launch out here into the question of baptisme of Hereticks, or by Hereticks. Thirdly (you say) If infants of wicked parents be capable of baptisme, because born in a believing Nation, then the privilege agrees to them, either in respect of their descent, or the place of their birth, or both. How is it that wicked parents are now brought in in this dispute? the question being of infants of parents professing Christ in generall, you seem to allow the baptisme of the infants of such parents that are not wicked but godly, and so Master Thomas Goodwin and you are agreed; and you well enough know that we hold that it is in respect of their descent that they are capable of baptisme, against this as the other you have your exceptions: If in respect of their descent, then either their descent within mans memory, or their descent beyond all the memory of man. I answer in respect of either, when a line of profession holds, or is again restored, that the infant may be received into the visible Church, and enjoy the saving ordinances of Christ Jesus. Fourthly (you say) if there be such a federall holinesse of a chosen, discipled or believing Nation, as may make the infants of that Nation, though their parents be openly wicked, capable of baptisme, this right must come from some grant, or Charter, or other. We finde indeed God would have the posterity of Abraham, and all the males in that Nation circumcised; so God appointed it, what ever their parents were, for reasons before rehearsed, but there is no such grant, promise,

miss, covenant, or appointment now to any nations of Gentiles, as was then to the posterity of Abraham. This is a meer *petitio principii*, an open begging of the Question, you know that we doe produce a Charter warranted not by one but many Scriptures, and we can with as great confidence affirme that there is such a Charter as you deny, why did not you then rest here, and have taken some more pains to overthrow the charter of so ancient a date, and so your pains might have been spared in blotting paper, to leade us so wilde a chase. Your examination (which you after speak of) *Rom. 11. 16.* hath been under examination, and if there be strength in those exceptions, there is weaknesse no where, Thus far your exceptions against any rule that may be given, to discern when a Nation, or any person in a Nation, is baptizable. Now let us see whether this argument of yours conclude not in another manner, to pinch and presse your selfe, then your adversaries, and to this end we must inquire into the rule which you lay down, when a Nation, or rather, any one in a Nation is baptizable, and least I should deale with you, as you have often dealt with me, you shall speak your own meaning in your own words, where Master Marshall, (interpreting Christs Commission) sayes, *Every Nation which should receive the faith, should be to him now as the peculiar Nation of the Jews had been in times past*, what sense these words may carry (you say is doubtful) pag 123. for either it may have (say you) this sense, *every Nation that receives the faith, that is, believers of every Nation, shall be to me a peculiar people, as the Jews were in the sense that Peter speaks, 1 Pet. 2. 9. and so the sense is good.* Now that Text *1 Pet. 2. 9.* you have at large interpreted to be meant of the Church invisible, your words are pag. 104. *Where Peter says There is a chosen Generation &c. it should be meant of any other then true believers, who alone can offer spirituall sacrifice acceptable to God through Jesus Christ is an interpretation which I disclaim.* Yea, you would have them meant of the vessels of mercie cnel, before prepared unto glory. *ibid.* These onely then are the men, discipled to be baptized, and to these words of Master Rutherford, *That God hath chosen the race and Nation of the Gentiles*, (you say) pag. 130. it is not right for God hath not chosen simply the race and Nation of the Gentiles, but a people to himselfe out of the race and Nation of the Gentiles, as it is said, *Rev. 5. 7. Thou hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue and Nation, Making no distinction at all betwixt Gods election into his visible Kingdom, and his election unto glory.* Now I assume that there is no rule whereby we may know when a man is in that sense of *A chosen Generation, a royall Priesthood, an holy Nation, a true believer,* so that he can offer a spirituall Sacrifice acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. There

is no rule whereby we may know when one is *A vessel of mercie afore prepared to glory*, when a man is one of the *redeemed ones to God by the blood of Christ*, and consequently there is no rule to know when any man in any Nation is discipled, so as to be baptized. And here I could easily be as large as you in an induction of particulars, if it be said it may be known, when a man is a hearer of the word, so he may be, and no doer, and so deceive himselfe, *James 1. 22.* If it be said when a man hears the Word gladly, and delights in it, so did *Herod* and the hearers compared to the rockie ground, *Luke 8. 13.* if it be said when they excite and call on others to heare, so did *Ezekiels* hearers, *Ezek. 33. 31.* when their hearts went after coveteousnesse. If it be said when they professe to believe, and are called believers, so it is with them that in time of temptation fall away, *Luke 8. 13.* If it be said when they have a competent measure of the knowledge of Christ, so had those that prophesied in his name, and were yet commanded to depart from him, *Mat. 7. 23.* If it be said when their lives are much reformed, so were the *Ninevites* by *Jonah*, *Herod* by *Iohn Baptist*. If it be said when all these be found in the same man, with an addition of universall obedience to the whole will of God, then such a man *cleanseth himselfe from all filthinesse of flesh and spirit, perfecting himselfe*, *2 Cor. 7. 1.* But such a spiritual cleansing can by no eye of man be discerned, and so no rule to know when a man is to be baptized, in vaine doe we look to have a visible marke put upon an invisible member, an outward badge and character upon a worke within and unseene, in the application of these Texts with your Comment to Christs commission of discipling Nations we may with better reason then you call for harpe and harrow, will you say when a man makes profession to be a vessel of mercie, and of the invisible body, though indeed he be not such, yet there is warrant that he may be baptized. Then you have not rightly given us the sense of Christs Commission, limitring it to the elect and redeemed by the blood of Christ, and making such onely Disciples. Will you say, when in charity we believe, a man is such indeed, believing, regenerate, and sanctified. To this I first Answer, That I know not where our charity is any where called to judge in this businesse. Secondly, I answer, if this may be admitted, it will necessarily bring along with it the justification of Infant-baptisme by your own confession, pag. 158 you say, *It is granted that those Infants who have the inward grace, meaning it actually, are not to be debarred of baptism, for then they are believers and Disciples*, and charity may as well judge each infant presented to baptism, to be such as those of grown years entered upon a profession, as in due place shall further be demonstrated.



## § 3 Concerning some Propositions charged by way of suppositions on Mr. Marshall and the Authour.

Pag. 130. You say as for Mr. Blakes argument because it falls in with your reason, I shall answer them together in that which follows, and after repetition of Mr. Marshals argument you say, This is your first argument to prove a command by cleer consequence from Mat. 28. 19. for baptizing Infants, adding The strength of it lyes in these suppositions, First, that Christ bid them baptize all nations after the manner that the Jews did circumcise one nation and (you say) Mr. Blake doth conceit this so strongly that he saith this cannot be denyed of any that will have the Apostles to be able to know Christs meaning by his words. in this enlarged Commission, I would willingly learn of M. Tombes where it is that I say so, & where it is that you gather that, I conceit this thing so strongly. This I do say Birth-priviledge, pag. 20. which sure are the words at which you drive. In the same sense and latitude, as a Nation was taken in respect of the Covenant and Covenant-initiating Sacrament was restrained to that only Nation, where their Commission was first limited. In the same sense it is to be taken (unlesse the text expresse the contrary) now the Commission is enlarged. And this the Reader may soon see to be far different from that which you fasten upon me. In saying that the word Nation is taken in the same sense, in this enlarged Commission, as it was when it was limited and restrained to one only Nation, I do not say that Christ bid them baptize all Nations after the manner that the Jews did circumcise one Nation, It is worthy observation what in the same page you acknowledge. It is true (say you) he enlarged their Commission, and bid them go and make Disciples of all Nations, and then to baptize the Disciples of all Nations, but the enlargement of Commission was not in opposition to the restriction about Circumcision, Gen. 17. but in opposition to the restriction, Math. 10. 5, 6. Which your Reader may very well thus understand. It is true, that it is not as by way of calumny, I have put upon Mr. Blake in the words immediately before, but as Mr. Blake in his Birth-priviledge hath expressed himself, I speake of the sense of the word Nation; when the Apostles Commission was first given in that limit or restriction, and their Commission was not given. Gen. 17. but Math. 10. 6. neither are you at the paines to make it appeare how the words of Christ were to the Apostles intelligible, if the word Nation in this enlarged Commission, must be taken in any other sense and latitude, their it was in their former limited Commission, when the Covenant and Covenant-initiating Sacrament was restrained to one Nation. Their former Commission was to go to one only nation and through that one to preach the Gospel of

of the Kingdome, and not to set up Circumcision, that one is commanded them and all other are forbidden them. In this present Commission they have a command to go unto all Nations about the same work, If there be an homonymy or ambiguity in the meaning of the word *Nation* how shall they then be able to perceive it? Nay, instead of a confutation you vouchsafe me a confirmation in your grant of this opposition, seeing *oppositiorum eadem est ratio*, as one opposite to the other is to be taken. The second supposition upon which you say Mr. Marshall's argument is grounded is *that the nation of the Jews were discredited when they were circumcised*. whereupon you presently adde, *I doe not impute it to Mr. Blake, through defect of ability to understand*. But whether is it (I pray) that I shall impute this and divers other like charges of yours upon me? I cannot impute it to inadvertency, That could neither be so frequent nor so grosse, whether therefore it is to be imputed, I leave it to the censure of others. The proposition which you put by way of supposition both upon mee and Mr. Marshall, I wholly disclaime both phrase and thing, *That the Jews were discredited when they were circumcised*, and how high thoughts you have both of me, and Mr. Marshall for understanding, you indifferently make to appeare, quoting the Declaration against the Anabaptists, where the Author saith, *that making Disciples is to be done by baptizing them*. You say, pag. 127. *the conceit is so absurd that you presume none that hath any wit will entertain it*. The wit is much alike, to say that Disciples were made by Circumcision, as to say that Disciples are made by Baptisme, there must be some right or title preceding, which Circumcision then, Baptisme now, doth confirme. Neither of these can be maintained, unlesse by a figure of Rhetorique which must not be admitted in a Logickall Dispute. A Christian is made a Disciple in Baptisme and a Jew was in Circumcision (if wee may apply a new Testament phrase to the old Testament practice) as a King by succession is made a King by his Coronation which doth not confer *jus ad rem* is no originall of his right to govern but only manifests *jus in re*, confirms his right of execution of government among his people. Not imputing this (which I never said nor thought) to be through defect of ability to understand, you do impute it to be *through the strong hold which these points (you say) have in my minde, that Baptisme succeeds Circumcision in the place, roome and use of it, and the Covenant of the Gospel is all one with the Covenant made to Abraham*. You can seldom hit on my words, and it were next to a wonder if you could finde what that is that hath so strong a hold in my mind. It was wont to be said that *sermo est animi index*, that words are interpreters of thoughts, and I never used these words that Baptisme succeeds Circumcision, in the roome, place, and use of it, how do

doe you then come to know that it hath so strong a hold in my minde: neither doe you barely know my thoughts, but the whole proceeding of them (as it seems) without any of my words you say; *this hath taken such strong hold in his minde, that he imagines there should be such allusion to circumcision, as that the Disciples might understand Christs meaning whom to baptize from the precept of circumcision, Gen. 17.* That which I doe say, you may finde Birth-priviledge, Pag. 14. *It is not barely the analogie between Circumcision and baptism, by which we inforce the baptism of infants, but the grounds of both circumcision and baptism, the Arguments drawn from analogie and proportion; I know to be liable to exceptions; and therefore did not onely forbear that course, but foreseeing the exception was carefull to prevent it, which you yet charge upon me, as though it were the alone basis on which my opinion is grounded, and yet, notwithstanding I am not of your minde, that all Arguments taken from analogie and proportion, in disputes of this kinde are to be slighted.* And here it were worth our pains a little to examine your discourse of arguing from analogie or resemblance, about which you make so great a flourish, and which you bring over and over in your discourse, which may as like take as any thing which you have said with an unwary Reader, bearing so fair a pretence of yout great care to stop the inlet of superstition and humane inventions into Gods worship, & though it may be here thought an impertinent digression, yet I am loath to passe by it.

§ 4. *A digression concerning Arguments drawn from Analogy or parity of reason, as well in positive as morall Commandments.*

In your defence of those that reject all that hath not an expresse institution in the New Testament, you say, Pag. 28. *That they mean it of positive, instituted worship, consisting in outward rites, such as Circumcision, Baptism, and the Lords Supper are, which have nothing morall or naturall in them, but are in whole and in part ceremoniall; further adding, For that which is naturall or morall in worship they allow an institution or command in the Old Testament as obligatory to Christians, and such they conceive a Sabbath to be.* I shall here omit that which I might insist upon, that most of those of whom Master Marshall speaks, and who in this concur with you in opinion will not admit your distinction, denying the Moralls of the Old Testament to be any more obligatory, then the positive or ceremoniall precepts, and apply my answer not to them, but to you, who return answer in their names: You cannot make any thing morall in the New Testament by way of analogie or resemblance



semblance with any thing in the Old Testament, but onely cleare it from  
 thence to be such, And though we cannot by any such argument from analo-  
 gie or proportion, make any thing in the New Testament to be positive wor-  
 ship which is not instituted and appointed, yet we may by this meanes get  
 light to know the nature of such a worship the end, extent, and other things  
 about it, and so there is equall use of analogie and proportion in positives, as  
 in moralls, such arguments are as valid in one as the other, therefore as the  
 Apostle reasons from analogie and proportion out of the Old Testament in  
 morall things for Ministers mayntenance, *1 Cor. 9. 9. 1 Tim. 5. 18.* That precept  
 of not muzzling the mouth of the ox, though among Judiciall precepts, yet  
 I acknowledge had morall equity in it, where we require labour as of right  
 and due, we must not deny subsistence, so he likewise reasons from analogie  
 and proportion in positive precepts, *1 Cor. 10. 16, 17.* Having affirmed that  
*we being many are one body, because partakers of one bread*, that this makes  
 us one ecclesiasticall body with those with whom we joyn, he makes it good  
 by analogie and proportion, from the Sacrifices of the Law, *Behold Israel af-  
 ter the flesh*, look upon the body of the Jews, and see if it were not so among  
 them, *Are not they which eat of the Sacrifices partakers of the Altar?* yea, he  
 further makes it good in the words that follow, even from the Heathen, it is  
 of the nature of religious worship, whether true or false, to make those of one  
 body (as I may say) religious that partake of them, yea, our Saviour Christ  
 defends his Disciples (when they were accused of the breach of the Sabbath  
 which was a law morall) by analogie and proportion of the like in *David*,  
 in a Law meerly ceremoniall, the eating of the shewbread, *Mat. 12. 3, 4.* there  
 being the same reason of obedience in a Law ceremoniall, or positive to them  
 that are under the Law, as there is in a Law morall, and the same reason of  
 excuse in those acts which are not *per se mala* evill in themselves, but in some  
 other reference whether they be referred to morall or positive precepts, so that  
 this distinction as here produced and applyed is of nouse at all, there is the  
 same reason and like liberty in arguing by analogie, in positive as in morall  
 precepts, you say, *Page. 29.* To me it is a dangerous principle upon which they  
 goe that so argue to wit, that in meer positive things (such as Circumcision and  
 Baptism are) we may frame an addition to Gods worship from analogie or resem-  
 blance conceived by us betwene two Ordinances, where of one is quite taken a-  
 way without any institution, gathered by precept or Apostolicall example. To  
 me this is as dangerous as to you, but you might have done well to have ac-  
 quainted your Reader who those be that goe upon any such principle, I  
 should have wondered who those men be, but that I see it a thing familiar  
 with

with you to put both principles and conclusions upon men which are so far from their pens or tongues that they never entered into their thoughts: but you plainly imply, though you doe not speake out, that your adversaries goe upon this principle which you very well know that they utterly disclaim, to what purpose else serves the dispute that in this 13 *Section* of your Letter you are upon? To what purpose do you say that *Mat. 28.* is not a command to baptize infants (and then answer so many arguments) But that those with whom you have to deale affirme it, we may as well charge you with deduction from the institution, as you us with addition, and are as well able to make good our charge. But this we shall not doe in your way of begging the question, leaving that practice to those that are at want of proofs: You goe on saying, *I desire any learned man to set me down a rule from Gods Word, how far I may goe on in my conceived parity of reason, equity or analogie, and where I must stay when it will be superstition and will worship, and when nor, when my conscience may be satisfied, when nor? Pag. 29, 30.* Before I return any direct Answer, let me premise, that rules of this kinde are not easie to be laid down, how far *ad punctum* we may goe, and where we must stop, in sundry other things (as in the use of things indifferent) where the practice it selfe is confessedly warrantable, you will hardly lay down a rule satisfying each conscience, how far a man may goe in the breach of the outward rest of the Sabbath and be blamelesse, when yet our liberty on severall occasions is manifest, and with this very argument wherewith you oppose Paedobaptism; &c. Master *Frimrose* I remember (though now I have not the book) disputes against the Sabbath. 2. Let me request that you wil gratifie us with your rules in this kind of reasoning in morals, which your self allow, exactly regulating & stinting us in this way, which wil be singularly usefull in many cases of conscience, & like to be helpful in this particular. These things premised, let me (that am none of the learned) here adventure upon your censure, and say somewhat supposing it may be easilier here done, then in some other things where yet the thing it self is unquestionable, I suppose therefore these three cautions following being observed, then this kind of arguing from analogie and proportion is without any such pretended danger.

1 When parity of reason or Analogy doth not institute any piece of worship or the least part of the service of God, but only helps to a right understanding of the nature, use, end, extent, of that which is instituted, so that that which you fear, lest by this means the Surplice, purification of women, with your, &c. p. 29 yea, the whole burthen of Jewish rites, pag. 7. of your exercitation should be brought in, is already prevented. Had Christ instituted any garments for holy

use in the days of the Gospel upon the antiquating of the Leviticall vestments, we might have borrowed somelight from the one for the use of the other, and so in Purification. But seeing no such thing is done by him, it may not be attempted by us; on the contrary had Christ instituted no Baptisme nor any initiating Sacrament in Gospell times, for us to have found out one correipondent to the practice of the Jews had been the wil-worship which you mention. But Baptisme being set up by Christ in the Gospell, as Circumcision was in the Law, The one well serves to illustrate the other, and wee may gather light from each for the understanding of both; Analogy may set up no ordinance, nor yet any other argument of reason, But declare the extent of an Ordinance what persons are in capacity for it, The application of an ordinance to a person may thence be gathered, you finde nothing in Scripture for excommunication of women, yet we find in the old Testament *Myriam* shut out of the Camp, *Numb. 12. 14.* and in all penalties for transgression in Scriptures we find no regard had of distinction of sex, and by consequence it is not to be denied that women offending are within this censure, you tell us *that divine appointment of tythes to be paid (in the Writings of Divines) is asserted by this kind of argument, Exercit. pag. 7.* which I take to be a very happy instance of yours in this place, and notably helps us in discovery of the truth in this particular, seeing the Apostle makes the self-same use of arguing from analogy and parity of reason, in this particular instanced, as our Divines doe for Infants Baptisme, our arguing from analogie in this dispute of Baptisme, is the self-same, and fully in imitation of his Dispute for Ministers mayntenance. *Do ye not know (saith the Apostle) that they which minister about holy things, live of the things of the Temple? And they which wait at the Altar are partakers with the Altar? Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the Gospell should live of the Gospell.* The Apostle (by this Argument of parity concludes, The extent of this Ordinance, who those be that must have benefit of it, Those had benefit which *waited in the Temple, that ministered at the Altar, and those must live that preach the Gospell.* It is a good argument from parity of reason for Ministers residence upon their charge (and not to put all over to Curats) which is drawn from that sharp rebuke of the Priests, *Ezek. 44. 8.* *And ye have not kept the charge of mine holy things, but have set keepers of my charge in my Sanctuary for your selves.* So it is as good an argument for their mayntenance so residing, which the Apostle *1 Cor. 9. 13, 14.* useth; But he does not thence conclude the determinate quantity, the *quotas* of the peoples revenue, that agrees not with the new Testament liberty, in no other point, then the Sabbath which had the honour to be determined



from the beginning, and still is equally honoured, so it is in this point of baptism, Divines by a like argument of parity or analogie, have concluded the extent of the Ordinance of baptism, shutting out no age, but have not thence concluded the determinate time, they bring it not to the eighth day, no more then we doe the tenth part in proportion for Ministers maintenance.

2 When in our reasoning from analogie, from the right understanding of any institution or ordinance, we doe not rest soly on the analogie that we finde with other commands, but have our further reasons for confirmation. Analogie if right gathered, will hardly goe alone but other arguments will be found to second it. *Paul* reasons from analogie for Ministers maintenance, *Christ* for his Disciples excuse, yet both had more to say in the same Argument, so it is here as analogie with circumcision doth evince baptism in that latitude to comprehend infants, so we have other arguments, not a few, also to warrant it, which though you say they do not satisfie, yet they may be satisfying, neither *Christ*s reasons from analogie, nor yet his other arguments could satisfie his adversaries.

3 When the analogie holds full proportion in that for which it is brought, so that nothing can fairely be brought against the one, but may also be concluded against the other: The Pharisees could say nothing against *Christ*s Disciples in the instance before mentioned, but the like might have been said against *David*, much is objected against the baptism of infants, as that they are in no capacity to beleeve, neyther were the infants of the Jews, and yet they were circumcised, and faith was no more necessary in baptism then circumcision, circumcision being a seale of the righteousness of faith: That they are not able to repent, neither were the infants of the Jews, and repentance equally was required in both Sacraments, circumcision signifying and sealing the circumcision of the heart, putting away the sin of the body and flesh, I know you finde out other differences, or rather multiply dissimilitudes without any reall difference: *The Covenant in which circumcision was grounded* (you say) *was not pure but mixt*, *Exercit. Pag. 2.* which before hath been answered, the Gospel Covenant admits the same mixture, having promises of this world annexed, as *Chamier* in answer to the argument of *Bellarmines* hath observed your illustration of the disparity between the covenants is notable; *The Covenant* (you say, with *Bellarmines*) *takes denomination from the promises, but the promises are mixt. Some evangelicall belonging to those to whom the Gospel belongeth, some are domestick or evill promises, especially respecting the house of Abraham.* If this distinction may passe then *Abrahams* family had no Evangelicall promises, Evangelicall promises did not belong to them, you make an opposition between promises belonging to those to who the Gospel belongeth, and

and the promises respecting the house of *Abraham*, Pag. 6. You say, *Circumcision* did signifie *Christ* to come, but *baptism* doth not signifie this, but points at the incarnation, death, and resurrection of *Christ*: But you should apply this difference, and make it appear how infants may have faith in *Christ* promised, and not in *Christ* revealed, *Circumcision* (you say) was a signe that the *Israelites* were a people separated from all Nations, *Rom. 3. 1.* but *baptism* signifieth that all are one in *Christ*, *Gal. 3. 28.* The same that *Circumcision* was in regard of distinction from Infidels in one Nation, the same *baptism* is in all Nations, you doe not shew us why an infant may have the outward badge of an *Israelite* then, and not of a *Christian* now. *Circumcision* (you say) signified that *Moses Law* was to be observed, *Gal. 5. 3.* but *Baptism* doth signifie that *Moses Law* is made void, and the Doctrine of *Christ* to be retained, *Act. 10. 37.* You are (it seems) of Master *Blackwoods* opinion, that faith, *Circumcision* did not bring any grace to the Jews, but was rather a joke or a curse, quoting your Text, *Gal. 5. 3.* which if you can reconcile with *Rom. 3. 1.* and *Rom. 4. 11.* You have a satisfying Answer, which (if you please) you may see laid open fully in the reply to Mr. *Blackwood*, Pag. 98. where you and the Reader, I doubt not may have satisfaction. *Circumcision* (you say) did signifie the promise of the Land of *Canaan*, *Baptism* eternall life by *Christ*. This Argument which is borrowed from *Bellarmino*, *Bellarmino* himselfe with ingenious acknowledgement doth correct, confessing *Canaan* to be a type of heaven, and quoting for it, *Heb. 11. 16.* making so frequent use of his Sophistry, you should not have left out his ingenuity, It signed, I am sure, that promise that was *Abrahams* justification and baptism is no signe of any other promise. Had the Pharisees had, but your head-piece; they might have shewed abundance of difference and disparity between that act of *Christ*s Disciples, rubbing eares of corne on the Sabbath, and that of *David*s eating the Shewbread, and so *Christ*s argument for their excuse had come to nothing: They rubbed eares of corne to fit them to eate, *David* did eat bread already fitted to his hand: They rubbed and eat in the open fields, *David* in the Tabernacle among the Priests, where his conscience might have satisfaction, *David* gives a satisfying reason to the Priest, They fall to eating, and give no reason at all: *David* asked it of the Priest, they made no demand of the eares of corne at all, *David* was under, at this time bitter persecution pursued by *Saul*, They suffered no such persecution, and therefore could not pleade necessity in a like degree, *David* at the most did but transgresse the letter of a Law ceremoniall, These transgresse the letter of a Law morall, but this is enough to shew that your dissimilitudes in this thing come to nothing.

Hereby (you say) the opinion of the Papists will be confirmed, who affirme from 1 Cor. 10. 11. the Sacraments of the Jews to be the types of the Sacraments of Christians which is rejected by Divines that dispute against Bellarmine. I pray you read over Bellarmine seriously (you had not his Works you say when you wrote your Letter) and then tell me whether the Arguments that hee useth to lay the Sacraments of the Jews as low as types, and to extoll the Sacraments of Christians as their Antitypes be not the self-same that you and your party make use of to make so large a difference betweene Circumcision and Baptisme, and the promises in Circumcision and Baptisme, Protestants deny them indeed to be types, because they affirme that they are in substance the same, our doctrine keeps us at a distance from Bellarmine, when you are in this reconciled to him, making the same differences as he doth between Circumcision & baptism. You tell us farther, the manner of arguing will countenance the arguments of the Papists for an universall Bishop, because there was an high Priest among the Jews: If this kinde of arguing would so serve for their purpose, it is strange that they have taken so much pains to multiply arguments against it, you well know (and make it appear that you know by making so much use of their arguments) that they make a great disparity betweene Circumcision and Baptisme. The promises in Circumcision, and the promises in Baptisme, and all to extoll the Sacraments of the Gospell above the Sacraments of the Law, denying eyther the Covenant or Seals to be one and the same in substance, in which you & your party close with them, for an universall Bishop in the days of the Gospell in a paralell way, as the Jews had in time of the Law, you well know we have such a one and the paralell betweene them both is at large set out by the Apostle to the Hebrews, no argument from analogie can lead us to any other. You further aske *What hindereth that we may not give children the Lords Supper, if we argue this way*: This was Master Blackwoods argument, I shall refer you to the answer returned to him, Pag. 94. 95. You further add that grave, godly, and learned men, have often warned that we take heed that we doe not rashly frame arguments from analogie; giving instance in Master Pager and Master Ball: It seems then that they would have us to frame arguments of this nature so that it be done warily, and for Master Ball he makes use of this very argument among others for baptism of infants, these are his words in his larger Catechism, Pag. 145. *Infants of Christians are within the Covenant, so them appertaineth the promise of forgiveness of sin, and the kingdom of God: Also Circumcision among the Jews, which answereth to our Baptisme was administred to infants: you lay it is to be considered again and again, how by these argumentations consciences may be freed from the dan-*



ger of will worship, and polluting so remarkable an Ordinance of Christ, as baptism is, specially this care lies on them, who by Prayers, Sermons, &c. doe deter men from humane Inventions: It appeareth by your grant that they are as conscientious as your selfe, to avoid such pollutions, and what hath been spoken, I doubt not doth abundantly free them, and I wish you as seriously to consider how you will avoid the danger of putting limit to an Ordinance of God, without any one word from his mouth, and shutting out those whom he never excluded, If you say there is not an expresse institution for infants, I say there is none for decrepit aged ones, it is sufficient that we have an institution and no age excluded, by this time I hope it appears how little you have spoke to the purpose, in going about utterly to cry down arguments drawn from analogie and proportion.

§ 5 *Infants of believing Parents, whether and in what sense they are Disciples.*

Pag. 134. You say Master Marshall adds, *And sure I am in Christs own dialect to belong to Christ, and to be a Disciple of Christ, or to beare the name of Christ, are all one, and that such infants doe belong to Christ, and beare the name of Christ, I have sufficiently proved already, and in the margine you cite, Matth. 10. 42. Mark. 9. 41. Matth. 18. 5.* where you further observe Mr. Blake pag. 21. seems to triumph in this argument, when he saith. *Who then is not afraid to refuse them who will receive Christ? Who will not baptize them that is willing to baptize Disciples in the name of Christ?* Giving first your censure upon it, but this is a triumph afore victory, then adding such a confutation that will give me leave to enjoy a victory if you please so to term it. The plain truth is (say you) *there's never a one of all these three texts speaks of little ones in respect of age, giving in your exceptions against each in particular, so that the Reader must necessarily take it for granted, that I have interpreted all of the three to be meant of little ones in regard of age, when if you look on my argument, you may easily see that the last only is by me so understood, but I am past wondering at such dealing I find it so ordinary, From Matth. 10. 42. Mark 9. 41. compared, I only gather that to belong to Christ, and to beare the name of Christ, and to be a Disciple of Christ, is one and the same thing, And this I am sure those Scriptures make good, as any may see that will examine and compare them, In quotation and explication of which texts I do not so much as mention Infants or little ones, After which I assume, That Infants are of the number of those who as Disciples, in Christs*

whether and in what sense they are Disciples.

81

account do belong to him, and bear his name, is yet further plaine by another text of Saint Matthew, where Christ setting a little childe in the midst of his hearers, saith *Who so shall receive one such little childe in my name receiveth me*, by all which it appears that which is done to Infants is done to Disciples, hath a glorious reward as done to Disciples. Infants therefore are Disciples of Christ, are of those that do belong to him and bear his name. The question then is not of the two former texts but of the third, *Matth. 18. 5.* whether it be to be understood of Infants which I having affirmed you deny, and say, first, the word is not Infant but little childe, who may be one able to speak. You know how promiscuously the Scripture useth those words, and sure you will not say that it was a childe of age to give an account of his faith, to professe Christ, confesse sin, and desire Baptisme, so his age would have been no pattern of humility, before that time nature puts them on to be sturdy: secondly, one such little childe is not meant (you say) of a little childe in age but a little childe in affection though an old man in age resembled by a little childe, as appeareth out of *V. 3.* one that is converted and made as a little childe, *Verse 4.* one that humbles himselfe as a little childe, *Verse 6.* one of those little ones that believe in him. He is indeed a childe in understanding that doth not see that your reference to *ver. 3, 4.* is wholly against you, *ver. 3.* little children must needs be taken, properly for children little in age, the samplar or pattern of conversion, unlessse you will understand Christs meaning to be, except you be converted & become as those that are converted, *ver. 4.* must needs be taken so likewise, who so humbleth himselfe as this little childe, pointing at the pattern of humility, *ver. 6.* *Who so shall offend one of these little ones that believe.* The number is purposely changed, and a note of difference is added, which may well be understood of little ones in resemblance. The 5. verse plainly refers to the childe that is drawn forth by our Saviour Christ for a pattern: The particle [Such] refers us to the pattern, not to those that follow the pattern, you produce Beza's authority, I may oppose Piscator, interpreting the Text properly: *Leyserus* in his continuation of *Chemnitius* his harmony, but reason is with me above all mens authority, onely Saint *Lukes* authority is above both, who in stead of, *Who shall receive one such little childe in my name*, hath it thus, *who so ever shall receive this childe in my name*, *Luke 9. 48.* and so his authority puts it out of question, therefore *Parvus* following the metaphor somewhat too far, seems to take notice of his oversight, and adds these words: *Aliqui putent esse commendationem puerulorum in aetate, & quidem hoc volunt Christi verba apud Lucam 9. 48. Quisquis recepit puerum hunc, &c.* Some think that these words, *Mat. 18. 5.* are a commendation of children in respect of age,

and so indeed the words of Christ, Luke 9.48. are to be understood: If you will still persist in your interpretation, and say the words in *Matthew* are to be taken in one sense, and the words in *Luke* in another, yet the words in *Luke* are enough for me, that infants beare the name of Christ, and doe belong to him, and consequently are Disciples: And here let me declare my selfe, what it is that I mean when I say Infants of believing parents are Disciples; Disciple is a New Testament word, (not above once that I know used in the Scriptures of the Old Testament, *Esay* 8.16. and there used in a more restrained sense then in the New Testament; the same as *Junius* well notes with *Esay* 54.13.) and in the New Testament the same with Christian, *Act.* 11.26. The Disciples were called Christians first in *Antioch*; comprehending all that have any relation to Christ, of as large extent as the words Israel, Israelite, Circumcision, people of God, and the like were in the Scriptures of the Old Testament. Infants having relation to Christ, bearing his name, and received in his name, as in the forecited Text is plain, they are of the body, not Heathen but Christian, and so consequently Disciples, as *Act.* 11.26. is further manifest: I doe not call infants Disciples therefore, as conceiving that they actually learn Christ, I have learnt of you that words must be taken not according to their Etymologie, but their use: nor because they are capable of the inward teaching of God, but because they are, as I may say, retainers to Christ, and designed for his school, and so *Tertullian* calls them (as you have heard) *Designati, candidati fidei*, They are of the body, and vested with the priviledges of those that strictly and actually are Disciples, If any will see this further enlarged, they may see the reply to Master *Blackwood*, Page 16. 17, 18, 19, 20.

§ 6. *A vindication of that Text, Esay 49.22. being a Prophecie, not directly of infant baptism, but of the access of Gentiles to the Church of Christ.*

Page 136. Master *Blake* (you say) hath one Text for a reserve, which he throws in array, let that Text of the Prophet be well weyed, where speaking by the spirit of Prophecie, of the rejection of the Jews, and the glorious call of the Gentiles in their stead, in that ample way, as it is there set out, hath these words: Behold, I will lift up my hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people, and they shall bring thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried on their shoulders, *Esay* 49.22. If there were but such a hint, as that by way of Prophecie to have left them behinde, we should from some have heard of it with a noise. You are much mistaken, that Text is brought up in a body together with other Texts, and leads the way to that which we were last upon; and therefore



therefore is no reserve, and here you give us a spice as of your wit; so of your candour; This Text is honoured in the Index of your first Treatise, as an argument produced *per se*, for the proof of infant baptism, and so makes up a whole Section, when you well know that it is brought onely for illutiration of that Text, *Mat. 28. 19.* to give some further light to that which by other arguments is evinced, that infants among others serve to make up the Church, are of those that are of Christs flock, belonging to him, and of the number of Christians, and so Disciples, you bring in that Text, *Deut. 23. 2.* of bastards, to confirme your exposition of *1 Cor. 7. 14.* If any should now write a Treatise, and put into his Index *The Argument drawn from Deut. 23. 2. for Anabaptism answered*, you would scarce thinke you had faire dealing, before you come to your answer in your wonted manner, you passe your censure, *It may be truly said (say you) the alleading of this Text for infant baptism, is but a noise, Vox & pretere a nihil, a voice and nothing beside, as the Spart an said of the Nightingale.* I wonder then that you did not wholly passe it by, since your profession is (*Pag. 78.*) to examine what hath any seeming strength; and *Pag. 171.* not to let pass any thing of weight in my Sermon; & there is little seeming strength or reall weight in the voice of a Nightingale, but we must conceive you here to be upon a merry pin; so mindfull of your self that you forget your word: The Question here is not (as after your manner, you mistake it) whether this Text proves infant baptism, but whether it gives any intimation, that infants in the dayes of the Gospel, be any members of the Church visible, or entitled to any priviledges of the Covenant, as Christs Disciples: To that end, and no other it was produced, let us heare what you say against it, you refer us to *Junius* his annotations on the words, *Hæc omnia allegorice dicuntur*, all these things are spoken allegorically, you might have done well to have given us *Junius* his words at large, I am well content to stand to his exposition on that place. *Cum vexillo Evangelii* (saith he) *quod est potentia Dei ad salutem curvis credentis*, *Rom. 1. 16.* *hæc autem omnia allegorice dicuntur, de amplexatione regni spiritualis Christi, ut propheta solent.* The standard of the Gospel, which is the power of God to salvation, to everyone that believes: When a Standard is lifted up in time of war, many resort to it, as to give assistance to their Prince, so also for their own shelter and defence: At the lifting up of Christs Standard, the Gentiles came in with little ones on their armes, and on their shoulders. They and their infants to the Church, which is the Kingdom of Christ, as to a place of shelter and safety. So that the words must needs be allegoricall, the Standard is allegoricall, and their carriage of their little ones must be understood no otherwile then of the access of the Gentiles with

their infants to the Church of Christ, you say, *Little ones might be brought for other ends then for baptism*. And who, I pray you, but your selfe speaks here of baptism, they are brought to the Church of Christ, that is the end here mentioned, and for which this Text is produced, and whether those that in an orderly Scripture way are rendered to the Church are to be baptized, shall (if you please) be disputed. Now compare this prophetic of the enlargement of Christs Kingdom with Christs own words concerning Infants, *Mat. 19. 14.* of such is the Kingdom of Heaven, and then let any judge whether this Text doe not speake as fully as a Prophetic can speake to the purpose for which it is brought, and that Text alleadged, God willing, in its due place shall be examined.

## CHAP. XII.

*Concerning the Baptisme of whole households, mentioned in Scripture, whether examples to be contemned?*

**S**ECTION 14 you examine the examples of Scripture for Infant Baptisme, particularly of baptizing households. Whereas Master Marshall says, *we have examples enough by good consequence*. You reply, *It may be well suspected these examples will prove like the commands by consequence, meer conjectures, and conceits of men that would have it so*. If you can improve your strength no better for the overthrow of the examples then you have of the commands, both commands and examples will stand in their full strength, and our conceits will be much strengthened by the weaknesse of so strong a man's abilities. Pag. 141. you say, *Wherefore I much marvell at the speech of Master Blake, Pag. 22. We have examples not to be contemned of the baptizing whole households, and whether Infants were there or no, as it is not certain though probable, so it is not materiall, The precedent is an househ'd. He that followeth the precedent must baptize households. It appeares not that any wife was there, yet he that followeth the precedent in baptizing of households, must baptize wives, and so I may say servants, if they be of the household*. You do not expresse your reason why this speech should be matter of so much marvell, perhaps it is because I do not say in your words (when you bring examples indeed to be contemned of womens receiving the Lords Supper) *we have expresse formall examples*. If this be it to take you out of your wonder, you may know, that I expresse not so high confidence upon stronger, as you do upon weaker grounds. But

perhaps your inference implies a reason of your marvell, you *Wherefore* sends us back to what you had said before, where we have from you these words: *The husband was converted sometimes without the wife, and on the contrary,* 1 Cor. 7. 21. and 1 Tim. 6. 1 Philip. 4. 22. *In the house of Infidell Masters were converted servants, and on the contrary,* Phile. 11. 12, 13, 16. And our Lord Christ foretold it should be so in the Preaching of the Gospell, Matth. 10. 35 36. Some in a house were sometimes converted and not all, and therefore you marvell that I say we have examples not to be contemned of baptizing whole households. Sometimes it was as you say, therefore you marvell at my confidence or impudence, that will say that it was ever otherwise. After your wonder follows your animadversion, which speech (say you) though it contains only dictates and might be let passe, yet it is not fit (you think) without some animadversions. This hath been your ordinary censure of the whole Treatise, what truth it bears, such as have heard you have spoken their thoughts, & let the Reader determine; If it be true (say you) that the precedent is an household & we must baptize households, I aske whether we must baptize wife, and servants, because they profess the faith, or because they be of the household. If the first be said, then the precedent is not of baptizing households, but baptizing a professor of the faith which is the thing that Antipedobaptists commend for. If because of the household, whether professing faith or not, then an unbelieving wife, or servant, should be baptized because they are of the household, unlesse it be supposed, that in an household, when the Master or the husband is a believer, the wife and servant cannot be an unbeliever, the contrary whereof hath happened above. But this I believe none will deny to be absurd and heterodox, and consequently that speech of Mr. Blakes is very absurd, that I say no worse of it. If you had any worse to say, I wonder that you had not spoke it, your best friends I believe will say that you have sufficiently shewed your selfe absurd in your language, I only say some more learned then I, as learned as you, have denied my words to be eyther absurd, or heterodox. For full answer I say, that wife and servant, as wife and servant, are in a capacity for Baptisme: The relation of wife or servant excludes neither of them, and in these households (if any were there) were actually baptized. If any of them with the Pharisees, Luke 7. 30. refused Baptisme, and rejected the counsell of God against themselves, then such exempted themselves, and the Scripture would not have said the whole family was baptized. It is sufficient that Scripture mentioning Baptisme of whole households, exempts none from a capacity of Baptisme, whether of us vent absurdities, let us both forbear (each is apt enough this way to be partiall) and leave it unto others to censure. To which former censure of yours (you say) I add



adde, That Master Blake gives no reason, nor I think can, why the baptizing of households, Acts 16. should be the precedent, for baptizing rather than the baptizing Samaria, Acts 8.12. the 3000, Acts 2.42. all Judaea, Matth. 3.5. I doe not read that the whole City of Samaria was baptized, If you can prove it, then I shall confesse it is a precedent to be followed, in case a City like Samaria, be converted as is the baptisme of households. For the 3000 that you mention, I say they are precedents for baptisme, and if you deny that the whole of them, every person of them were baptized (as you doe that whole households were) but have your distinctions to avoid it, you must give mee leave without regard of your distinctions to believe it: your third instance of all Judaea, Matth. 3.5. carries colour (and so do not the former) of an objection. It seems you would have the words where Scripture mentions whole households to be understood with its limits, as those words all Judaea. But though sometimes a restriction must needs be yielded of the word all, as the context makes manifest, yet it will not follow, but that ordinarily it is to be taken properly without any such restriction: Interpreters understand that speech, Matth. 3.5. in a vulgar way all Judaea, for some considerable numbers out of every part of Judaea, you doe not sure intend to have this of the whole households paralell with it, that some out of every part of the house, out of the Hall, Parlour, &c. were baptized. By this time (I suppose) it appears that I did not without cause say that we have examples, not to be contemned, for the baptizing of whole households.

### CHAP. XIII.

A vindication of that text, Matth. 19.14. Mark 10.14. with answer of six severall exceptions taken against it, and the consequence of Infants Baptisme thence demonstrated.

**S**ECTION the fifteenth, you speak of Infants capacity of inward grace, and there you fall upon the examination of that text, Matth. 19.14. and of the inconsequence (as you say) of Pædo-baptisme there on. Mr. Marshall bringing this Argument. To whom the inward grace of Baptisme belongs, to them belongs the outward signe; but the Infants of believers are made partakers of the inward grace of Baptisme: you reply, Pag. 145. the Answer to be proved is, that all the Infants of believers, or the Infants of believers, in as much as they are the Infants of believers, are actual

partakers of the inward grace of Baptisme, else your Argument would not serve for your purpose. You might have given Master Marshall leave to have explained his own Argument, which hee expresseth thus (as by you it is related.) *That the Infants of believers even while they are Infants, do receive the inward grace as well as grown men.* That therefore is the Proposition to be proved. All grown men baptized, have not the inward grace. & yet baptized aright: so also it is of Infants. It is sufficient to make this Argument good, that they are not only in a remote passive capacity, so stones in the street are to be made children to *Abraham*, but they have an access in Gods ordinary way of dispensation, even whilst Infants: Presently you fall upon that text, *Mar. 10. 14.* the same with *Mar. 19. 14.* which is indeed no text to prove that all Infants have inward grace, but that all Infants of believing parents, belong to the Church of Christ, and have right to Church priviledges. Here you would faine prove with *Piscators* Arguments. *That the speech of Christ is not of Infants, but of children which were capable of instruction,* and with this help you endeavour to answer some Arguments brought to prove them to be Infants; *Piscators* over eager desire to be quarrelling with *Lutherans*, who hold that Infants have a *cthall* faith, put him on this conceit, That these were capable of instructions, when yet from thence he infers, the lawfulness of Infants baptisme. You have one argument to prove that they were not Infants; in that *Christ* called them, *Luke 18. 16.* But this is easily answered hee called for them, hee called that they might have access unto him, *Where as it is s. 11. in Mark, hee took them up in his arms, the word so translated (you say) is used, Mark 9. 36. for the embracing of those which were of some growth, whom hee p'aced in the midst, and of whose scandalizing hee here warns.* There is not a word of scandalizing of them in *Mark* mentioned, as you may see if you please to see, if you look with your own eyes. In *Matth. 18.* there is indeed, but you even now contend it, that that is meant of children in resemblance, (which I also granted) but now you are pleased to contradict it: *Nor doth the word* *ἑταῖρος* *used, Lvk. 18. 15. translated in English Infants, prove it, for it signifies a child capable of teaching as when it is said Timothy knew the sacred Scripture from a child, 2 Tim. 3. 15.* Who knows not that proverbiall speech, of acquaintance, *usque à cunabulis*, even from the cradle, it is not said, hee knew the sacred Scripture being an Infant, as the word beares, but from an Infants age as he was so past Infant-age that he was capable of instructions. *Nor doth the word (you say)* *προσέλασθαι*, *translated (brought unto him) prove, that they were Infants, for the same word is applyed to them, that were guided, though they were not carried, but did go by themselves, as the blinde, and deafe Damaianck, Mat. 22.*

and the Lumatick child, Matth. 17. 16. These children never had the use of limbs, and reason to come to Christ of themselves, and the other were deprived of them. If we should yield that these children could not go alone, but lead by the hand, you would scarce yield that they were of age to be baptized. But if you can answer these three reasons alleaged, let me entreat your pains to answer three more. 1 If these children were of capacity to be instructed, why did the Disciples deny their access to Christ, why what reason can be conceived, but they might come as well as other hearers? 2 Why are not the children rebuked for coming? they are capable of rebuke that are capable of instruction. 3 Why was there no word of instruction given them? not so much as a syllable that was spoken to them. In the words that follow, Christ holds a large discourse with the young man, why is it then that he saith nothing to these younglings when they come to him, to which we may add that which hath been spoken, if they were old enough to be instructed, they were too old to be patterns in nature of innocency and humility. Secondly, (you say) *It is not doubtfull whether our Saviour said of them is the Kingdom of heaven, for the word is not true of such, not true of these.* And Luke 18. 17. *Mat. 19. 14. both add this speech. Verily, I say unto you, who so ever doth not receive the Kingdom of God as a little child shall not enter therein: like to which is that, Mat. 18. 3.* It is well that you onely say it is doubtfull, and have not confidence to affirme the contrary: But you say there are two exceptions against this: First, because this had been no reason why they should suffer little children to come to him, because of such is the Kingdom of God: Secondly, he might as well have said, suffer sheep or doves to come to me, for of such is the Kingdom of God. These two are but one, and fully shews that Christs reason is no reason, according to your exposition, children must come in their infancie, because when they themselves had no right to the Kingdom, others like to them in some resemblances have right to it: To this exception you reply, *The reason may be conceived that therefore you should not despise that age as profane, and keep them from me, for even they that are my Disciples must become children again, in putting off their vices, being converted, unlearning what they have learned, becoming humble and docible, which things could not be resembled by sheep and doves:* When this Argument in conference was urged upon you, I doubt not but you remember that you took time to consider for an answer, and this is it which after two years time hath brought forth, If you had waited so long for an answer from any hand, and at last had received such an one, we should have heard of *parvulus in montes*, your glosse upon the reason of Christ is just this: You seeke a blessing for your infants, and to that purpose you



you here present them, who yet in infancie have no interest at all in me, but are without covenant of promise, without God, without hope, and I might justly say, It is not fit to take the childrens bread and cast it to doggs, yet let them come, their age is not so prophane, but that when they are come, I may borrow a similitude, and draw a comparison from them, yea, such a one as I cannot from other creatures, though innocent and meek, yet not docible, thus you will have us to conceive of Christs reason, yet had our Saviour seen them as docible as you conceive them, we had heard as well of his instructing, as his blessing of them. You goe on, *This dly, but let it be granted that these were infants and that τῶν τῶν, is to be expounded as Beza in his annotations on Mat. 19. 14. These and the like, yet there is no certainty, only conjectures that they were believers infants.* Here is certainty beyond conjecture, and to that end doe not onely consider where Christ then was, namely, in the coasts of *India*, as you after observe, but to whom he was sent *Matth. 15. 24.* whose Minister he was, *Rom. 15. 8.* and wherefore their Minister, and how different his carriage was, when a Canaanitish woman came to him in the behalfe of her daughter, *Mat. 15. 22, 23, &c.* If these had had no other interest, Christ would have been as facile to others as to them: *Fourthly* (you say) *But let it be granted, that they were the infants of believers, and that it is said of these is the Kingdom of God, it may be, as Piscator observes, referred to their present estate, as if for the present they were in the Kingdom of God, that is believers and justified, but that they were elect persons, and so in time, of them should be the Kingdom of God.* Now that which gives right to baptism is the present estate of a person. I know not who will accept of such a grant, Christ speaks not of those individuall ones, that theirs is the Kingdom of heaven, but of all, so in title, *Such is the Kingdom of heaven*, neither can I finde that in *Piscator* that you quote out of him, but I doe finde that which is expressly contrary in his *Analysis* on *Mar. 10.* he thus renders us Christs reason, *Si talium puerorum (natorum scilicet & educatorum in Ecclesia) est regnum Dei non est eis neganda ben. dictio, quae scilicet destinata est ad promovendum, ipsos in regnum Dei: Atqui talium puerorum (natorum, scilicet & educatorum in Ecclesia) est regnum Dei, Ergo, &c.* If the Kingdom of heaven be of such children, namely, (that are born and bred in the Church) then such blessing is not to be denied them, which may promote them in this Kingdom: But of such children (that are born and bred in the Church) is the Kingdom of Heaven, therefore, &c. It is not infants election or justification, but their birth and breeding in the Church, that *Piscator* sayes gives them admission, if election and justification were alone, that which had given these infants their title, Christ had never

been so much displeased with his Disciples for forbidding them, seeing their election and justification was to the Disciples wholly unknown, they had a present visible title, such as the Apostles ought to have known, and therefore the reason must be referred to their present estate and condition, for their election or justification, I know not why any should enquire after it, neither can I subscribe to Master *Thomas Goodwin* (though in this you agree with him) that these infants were infallibly, eternally blessed, no more then I am of the minde that all *Zachens* his house were certainly saved, Christ speaks of it as a common priviledge of all infants of the Church, and gives a generall license to others as well as these to come to him; if this hold, then if all *Israel* had brought their infants they had all been saved, whereas some say that those whom Christ blesseth, must needs be eternally blessed. I answer, we must distinguish of Christs actions, as a private member of the Church, as a publike Minister, and as the Messiah or Saviour of his people. All those that he prayed for as a private person had not the answer of his prayers, he prayeth for his persecutors, *Father, forgive them*, in which he did the duty of the Law of God, and left us an example to pray for them that despitefully use us, *Mat. 5. 44.* Neither were all that he instructed as a publike minister taught of God, *Mat. 12. 41.* and so all that he blessed in a ministeriall way were not therefore necessarily everlastingly blessed, and that these who presented these infants, looked after no other blessing for their children, is your own observation: You add, *Faithfully*, But let that be also granted, yet all this proves not your minor, unlesse you can prove that the reason why the kingdom of heaven belongs to infants, is common with these to other infants of believers, and the reason why theirs is the Kingdom of God, is because they were the infants of believers, but this cannot be true being contrary to expresse Scripture, *Rom. 9. 6, 7, 8.* It is true that neither follows unlesse this be proved, Christs words are without limit to those to whom he was visibly sent, of such is the kingdom of heaven, and *Rom. 9. 6.* is no contradiction but a confirmation of it, *Israel* was the kingdom of God, *Numb. 23. 21.* *Esay 8. 8.* They were all of *Israel*, and therefore of the Kingdom of God, And inferring this error (you say) that a childe hath right to the kingdom of God in that he is the childe of a believer, and experience proves innumerable of them have no interest in the kingdom of God. Your adversaries you know are as confident that it is a truth, as you are that it is an error, and what proof of experience this is that you speake of, you doe not tell us, nor what that interest is that you deny innumerable of them, if you meane the invisible Kingdom, where Christ reigns by his spirit, then it is true that you say: but nothing to the purpose, if you meane the visible Kingdom where hee

is present in his ordinances, then wee deny that any experience shews that they have no interest, and for this it is that we contend, A certain interest in Christs visible kingdom, and a capacity according to his ordinary dispensation of interest in his mysticall body: You add, *Besides this reason may be given, why these infants did belong to Gods Kingdom, because they were such as Christ would blesse, and then all that you can gather from hence, will be that of the infants of believers (whom Christ blesseth) is the Kingdom of heaven.* Time is trifled out in speaking of these infants who did but give the occasion to that speech of our Saviour, which concerns all the infants of believers, every other infant in Israel had like title to this blessing, which is a Church privilege, *Numb. 6. 22, 23 &c.* which that which you quote out of *Grotius* in your margin doth also confirme. *Lastly (you say) Christs action in it is businesse is proper to him as the great Prophet of the Church and extraordinary, and therefore yields no ground for an ordinary rule of baptizing by the publique ministry.* I wish you to consider how this can stand with that which before you said, *That these might bring infants without faith in Christ as the Messiah upon the same of his miracles, and the conceit that he was a Prophet, and so they might bring children to him to be blessed, as Jacob and Esau, by Isaac, Josephs children by Jacob: What they desired Christ did, and that which he was ready to have done to any others, which was onely a ministeriall action, his graces as Messiah were not so common: And for that which you say, That this action of his, can be no ground for an ordinary rule of baptizing by the publique ministry.* I doe not wholly gainsay, we do not thinke that this blessing was baptizing that these desired, or that Christ intended their baptism, onely we affirme that a *medium* hence may be taken from whence we may infer the right of infants baptism, They that are admitted to one Church-priviledge may not be denied another, whereof they are equally capable, but infants are here admitted, and order taken for their admission to one Church-priviledge, of which they are no otherwile capable then of baptism, so that there is no direct precedent for baptism in particular, but for Church priviledges, of which infants are capable. None that are interested in the Church of Christ, which is his Kingdom, may be denied an admission to it by baptism, but infants have their interests in the Church of Christ which is his Kingdom, and therefore may not be denied admission by baptism, A-ground it is not immediate, expresse, but by necessary consequence, so that you must either come in with your *Seventhly*, or else infants are hence concluded to have right of membership in the Church, to have title to Church-priviledges, to be subjects in Christs Kingdom, and by consequence to have right of baptism, your six are all too



light. I take notice of one passage of yours. *Pag. 159. A Minister in this case is to act as a steward, who is to deal according to his Lords will, and not his own minde.* But it is the minde of the Lord of the family, that those should be taken in that are of the family, and therefore it is the Lord Christs will that infants (concerning whom he hath declared his mind) should not be excluded, and it is not to be questioned, but that Christ is as sore displeased with those that forbid them, this Church-priviledge as he was with his Disciples that forbad them the other; and therefore your so large discourse of wil-worship and the evill of it here might have been spared, but that you know it is a taking theame with those that have a zeale of God, and raised to an hatred of superstition, who yet many of them want that light of knowledge to avoid other extreams, with the like bayt of the odiousnesse of compulsion of conscience, many take well meaning ignorant ones. This, I say, might have been spared, seeing the Lords will is as elsewhere, so here declared, and though it were confest that it had no more warrant then you conceit, yet I do not know how it could come within the verge of wil-worship, you say a worship without institution in the word, is a wil-worship, now if you could assume that baptisme is a worship without institution in the word, then indeed you might conclude that worship (which you charge upon us) if you say there is no institution of infant baptisme, I answer, that I never heard of severall institutions applyed to the severall growth of persons, one institution serves for the oldest man and the youngest infant, and in case there were a misapplication of an instituted Ordinance to a person, this were an abuse of an Ordinance, not a wil-worship: If the Sacrament of the Lords Supper were administered to the unworthiest of Communicants, to the incestuous Corinthian, as doubtlesse it was before eviction: or excommunication denounced against a sincere orderly walking Christian, here men would say were an abuse of ordinances, but I thinke none ever charged this with wil-worship: But we neither yield it to be a will-worship, nor any abuse of worship, but according to the minde of Christ Jesus, There is not a distinct institution for them, neither is there for women, but they are within the institution, bearing the name of Christ, *Luke 9. 48.* and therefore Christians, and being Christians they are also Disciples, *Act. 11. 26.* having their title to the Church, and admitted by Christ to a Church-priviledge, being equally capable of baptism as infant Jews were of Circumcision, being holy with the body of the Church Christian, as the infants of the Jews were of the body of Israel, *1 Cor. 7. 14.* comming from an holy root, *Rom. 11. 16.* and being within the grand Charter made unto *Abraham, Act. 2. 39.*

CHAP. XIV.

*Of the knowledge requisite concerning the persons to be baptized, and that according to Master Tombes his grounds, no persons without extraordinary revelation are baptizable.*

**I**N your fourth part, you under take the answer of the Objections, which Antipædobaptists have brought against Infant-baptism, which hath little in it but what elsewhere you mention. In your third Section you speak of the knowledge requisite concerning the persons to be baptized, and there you say, *It is granted that those who have the inward grace, meaning it actually, are not to be debarred of Baptisme*, for then they are believers, and Disciples, and afterwards. *This I grant to Master Blake that those that are thus entituled, through want of institution are not to be excluded: for according to this supposition, in this case the institution is cleere for them; for they are sanctified persons, and so believers and Disciples of Christ.* But it is meet to take in with it, what you have Pag. 134. where you are upon the words of Christs Commission: And upon occasion of Master Marshalls words, *That infants at the present are capable of Christs own teaching*, you say, *I deny not but infants are capable of Christs own teaching, yea, of actuall faith. yea, of actuall profession of faith: The same power that could make John Baptist in his mothers wombe sensible of the presence of Christs mother, and to leap for joy, that could open the mouth of Balaams asse, can out of the mouthes of babes and sucklings perfect prayse.* But then it is done in an extraordinary way, and extraordinary accidents make not an ordinary rule: Let us from hence if it may be, (comparing what elsewhere you speak) gather your full mind, as well concerning the salvation of infants, as that which does give title to baptisme, Infants (you confesse) may have inward grace, and that by the teaching of Christ, whence also follows (that which you would have us to believe you hold) that infants may be saved, deny one of these and you deny both, grant one and grant both: It is true of infants and men of years, *except they be born again, they cannot enter into the Kingdom of heaven. Flesh and bloud cannot enter into the Kingdom of heaven,* hitherto we will agree. 2. You hold that this is done by the omnipotent power of God, as usually as actuall faith and a profession of it is wrought in them, as asses are made to speake with mans voice, and children in the womb leap for joy at the sensible presence of one that speaks to their mother. These you joyn together, so that this is the comfort that you leave parents when in-  
fants

fants believe, make profession of their faith, asses speak, and infants in the wombe know a voyce, and rejoyce upon hearing it, then their children may be sanctified, and dying in infancy saved; The two first of which I know not shatever they were: The third was but once, the last is disputed whether ever or never, *Factum est divinitas in infante, non humanitas ab infante*, as I remember *Iansenius* hath it; 3 You hold that in these extraordinary cases, such infants may be baptized, then they are sanctified persons, and Disciples of Christ. So that (it seems) as elsewhere you declare your selfe. These are *Synonyma*, one and the same, no Disciple unlesse sanctified, and in that sense believer; 4 You hold that these extraordinary evidences (so you call them) cannot make an ordinary rule of baptizing, for *Extraordinarium non facit regulam communem*, Pag. 158. So that the sanctification of an infant, you make still an extraordinary accident, These are not brought in, in a discourse of Miracles, but upon an occasion of an infants capacity of inward grace, which these Miracles are brought to illustrate, otherwise what doe wee with the mention of them, that accidents extraordinary can make no rule we easily grant, and therefore vvhen the *Lutherans* bring *Iohn Baptist* leaping in the wombe, for proof of actuall faith in infants, your answer is justly returned by *Bellarmino de Baptis. lib. 1. cap. 11*. But to confound this vvith the inward work of grace, and of the spirit, wrought in infants is not be suffered. *Chamier* having instanced in *Jeremy, Iohn Baptist, Samson*, for proof of sanctification in infants, and consequently of salvation, he sayh, *I know Jeremy and Iohn Baptist are set forth by Papists as examples extraordinary and of speciall priviledge, But (saith he) I deny not that they have this out of Scripture, for though it be peculiarly spoken of them, yet it is not therefore a speciall priviledge, for it is peculiarly spoken of Jacob that he was beloved of God before hee was borne, yet Paul makes use of that, as an argument, for proof of an universall doctrine, belonging to all the Elect. If one were by the speciall priviledge then the other.* *Chamier. Panstrat. Cathol. Tom. 4. lib. 5. cap. 10. Sect. 10.* And you know the *Arminians* the same, to the instance of *Pharaoh* of an hardened heart, and have the same answer from the Orthodox Writers, you would teach them to reply that God that gathered the waters together on a heap, might work to the hardning of a heart, and then adde, *Extraordinarium non facit regulam communem*. These are your arguments (such as they be) for the Negative, that the supposition of inward grace is no ground of baptism of infants, in which I can willingly so farre joyne vvith you, that it is not our presuming, or charitably hoping, that is, or that infant is in grace, that is our ground of such an Infants baptism, vve must have some vvhat that is infallible and visible yet



being it is no vvork extraordinary, or out of Gods course to give grace to infants in the Church : They have accesse by Gods gracions dispensation (not priviledge extraordinary) to saving graces : they have right to Ordinances and Church priviledges vvhich is Gods vvay at pleasure to convey them. And this is it I suppose vvhich *Amesius* means, in answer to *Bellarmines* argument, That spirituall promises descend to us not by carnall generation of parents but spirituall regeneration of Christ, vvhere he sayth, *Spiritualis regenerationem*, &c. We confesse that spirituall regeneration is necessary to the solid participation of the promises, but regeneration is a part of the promises which in a singular manner belong to the children of believers, as the forme of the covenant it in selfe doth manifest. *Bellar. Enervat. Tom. 3. lib. 2. quest. 1. Sect. 5.* So that vvith him (no *Arminian*) the promises, and the thing promised, the covenant entred, and the graces of the covenant do differ, parent and child in the Church God saves; not generally all, neither parents nor children, but according as he pleaseth. Neyther parent, nor child therefore may be denyed saving Ordinances, even from infancy their title to Ordinances must be manifested, Now for the affirmative, vvhat that is that doth entitle, you say very little, or vvhat knowledge we must have of their title that are to be baptized. And here it is very well worth our pains to enquire in a few words, whether according to your grounds (if you will stick by them) any person in the World be baptizable. And I believe you will be found to exclude, father and child, young and old from baptisme. 1. None may be baptized that are not within Christs Commission, *Go and teach all Nations*, This is your ground and mine, as well as yours, but Infants are not within the Commission as you (if you may be believed) have proved, That *Adults* of ripe yeers are not within the Commission you expressely say, pag. 133. vvhere both Mr. *Marshall* and I say, *The children in every Nation make a part of the Nation*, you reply, *So do the Infidels that are Adults of ripe yeers, and yet are not therefore included in this speech, Go and teach all Nations, and baptize them.* I pray you who then could they find to teach and disciple, But this I suppose was a slip. 2. None but those that are Disciples, and whose title, as Disciples is known may be (according to your ground) baptized, both of these you have laid down, Though Infants (in cases extraordinary) may be Disciples, being sanctified, yet because this cannot be discerned, they may not (you say) be baptized. But disciple vvith you, is one of the chosen generation, the royall Priesthood, only such a one can offer spirituall sacrifice acceptable to God in *Jesus Christ*, as your words are plaine to any that will compare vvhat you say, pag. 104. pag. 123. You make those vvhom God hath chosen of the race of the *Gentiles* for baptisme, to be only such

such whom *Christ hath redeemed out of every tongue, kindred, and Nation by his blood*, Revel. 5. 9. pag. 130. Mr. Rutherford (whom you there oppose) speaks of this choice, and so you understand him, pag. 123. In this place you make one that hath attained to inward grace, a sanctified person, a believer, and a Disciple to be the same. Now this cannot be discerned by any, wee have no way to know such a Disciple. And therefore as a sanctified Infant, for want of an extraordinary revelation, cannot be baptized, so neyther any other without such a spirit of discerning. 3 Eyther it must be some priviledge externall, or some work internall, that will suffice to give admittance to baptism. If you grant that an externall priviledge will serve (as the name believer, the profession of faith, or the like) as sometimes you lay downe, then here is that externall Covenant which the Pædobaptists avouch, Then men are denominated holy, who are not inwardly sanctified, nor able to offer spirituall sacrifice acceptable to God in Jesus Christ. And so you have taken off all the advantage, which you say the Independents in this point have: This is the covenant holinesse which wee assert, and which, you, and they oppose. You know Mr. Goodwin whom you vouch, denyed (at *Bow*) any holinesse in the days of the Gospell, other then that which is reall, and therefore made regeneration only (either indeed, or charitably believed) the ground of baptism. And when you leave the old way, the good way, the Scripture way, There is no way left consistent with your grounds for baptism of any persons, you can no where find such a Disciple, that according to your own principles is baptizable.

## CHAP. XV.

### §. 1. *The Seals of the Sacrament are conditions not absolute.*

**P**AGE 164. Upon occasion of a question of Master Marshalls by way of objection, *What benefit comes to children by this kinde of sealing in baptism, seeing it is but a conditionall sealing on Gods part, viz. that they own and ratifie it when they come to age, &c.* And not staying for his answer you reply, *I cannot allow this, to say that God seals to everyone that is baptized. It is true that baptism is in its nature a seal of the righteousness of faith, 1 Pet. 3. 21. But yet God doth not seal this to everyone that is baptized, but onely to true believers.* If you were demanded concerning the author of baptism in those words of our Saviour to the Pharisees, is it of heaven or from men? I thinke you

you would deny it to be of men, and acknowledge no author but God, If God appointed it, and the nature of it is to seal, then in every administration God seals, or else Baptism loses its nature, you confesse that God seals to true believers, and if only to true believers, then not onely the benefit to us, but the nature of the Sacrament, as of Gods institution, depends upon our believing: As the Priest by intending or not intending, makes it with the Papists a Sacrament, or no Sacrament, so wee by believing or not believing: So the text says not well that *Simon Magus* was baptized who in your sense was no believer, unlesse *Luke* there mean a common washing, and not Sacramentall, which is against the context, he was baptized as other Converts in *Samaria*, you go on, *What is Gods sealing but the confirming of his promises? But God promises righteousness onely to believers, and therefore hee seals onely to believers.* This is your argument, Such as Gods promise is, such is his sealing, And I assume Gods promise is upon condition of believing, such was his promise to the jaylour, *Acts* 16. 30. And accordingly was the jaylours baptism: There are seals of the Sacraments, and there is a seal of the spirit, both are of God, but in a different way. The spirits seal is upon, and after the work of the grace of faith, began in the soul, *Ephes.* 1. 13. No man not in the faith was ever thus sealed, and therefore this is entrusted in the hands of none, but is the Spirits immediate work upon the soul, This is proper to the Church invisible, *The new name written in the white stone, which no man knoweth, save he that receiveth it, Revel.* 2. 17. The other seals are of a greater latitude, put into the hands of the Ministers of visible Churches, who have not the power of discerning where the saving work of the spirit is, and where it is not, and therefore can put to no seal, absolute but conditionall, requiring faith to justification and other sanctifying graces to salvation, you go on, *As for the sealing by God, upon condition that persons acknowledge the covenant, it is but a notion, The Scripture makes not Gods promise in the covenant of grace, conditionall in that sense, For Gods promise is to those he enters covenant with, is, That he will put his law in their hearts, and in their minds will write them.* If you mean by the sealing of God, his immediate seal of the spirit, this is a truth, this is after faith, and the engraving of the law in the heart, but if you mean it of the seal of the Sacraments as your words beare, then according to your opinion none ought to be baptized but hee in whose heart the law is wrote, Here is then work for those that make the scrutiny of the *competentes*, which you speak of out of *Chamier*, and what I have formerly observed (that according to your tenent no man knows what person may be baptized) is unanswerably confirmed, They that cannot know the person to be sealed, cannot know

O the



98 *The Seals of the Sacrament are conditions not absolute.*

the person to be baptized, This is plain, Baptism in the nature of it is a seal, but according to your doctrine none can know the person to be sealed, this is evident unlesse you can know by a mans face (as some have undertaken) when Gods Law is written in the heart, you take liberty frequently to urge us with *Bellarmines* arguments, though you conceal his name, Give mee leave to presse one of his upon you, disputing against that of *Chemnitzius*, that the Sacraments are seals to confirme to me in perticular, that which is promised in generall, *De Sacra. in Gen. lib. 1. cap. 14.* This is his fifth argument, *Si Sacramenta essent testimonia gratia quae in particulari confertur alicui, saepe numero falsa essent nimirum cum Sacramentum ministratur homini, qui fingit se credere, cum credere non credat, proinde non liceret, ullum baptizare ne cogeremus Deum testificari falsum, de nullo exim certo scimus, credat ne vere an fingat se credere.* If the Sacraments be seals of grace, which in perticular is conferred upon any, then they are often false, to wit, when the Sacrament is administered to a man who pretends to believe, and indeed doth not believe. And so it were not lawfull for any to baptize, lest we should cause God to give witnesse to a lye, for we certainly know of none whether they believe truly, or alone pretend it. We have also your quotations of men, not onely out of the Pulpit, but in privat discourse. I could gratifie you with some, but I forbear, that have sayd, that this argument of *Bellarmines* is unanswerable, unlesse we confesse that the seal of the Sacrament is conditionall, Nor do I know any (say you) but *Corvinus* in his *Examen of Moulins Anatomie*, cap. 9. Sect. 6. And the *Arminians* that speak, &c. your speech hath more in it, but this must first be spoke unto. *Angesius* in his reply to that argument before-named of *Bellarmines*, sayeth of the Sacraments, *Non sunt testimonia completa, & absoluta nisi credentibus.* They are then evidences and seals (those words are used promiscuously by *Bellarmines*) in-complete and conditionall to others, which afterwards he expresses in plain terms, *Cum conditione tamen intelliguntur respectu eorum qui non credunt.* They are understood with condition respectively to those that do not believe. *Bellar. Exercit. Tom. 3. lib. 1. cap. 1. quest. 4.* This I hope will not cause him to passe with you for an *Arminian*, no more then that which he hath in the same page, will cause him to passe for a Jew. All that is spoke of Circumcision and does belong to the Sacrament all nature of it, which it hath in common with other Sacraments, is rightly applyed unto all Sacraments; and presently after, Although all that is spoken of Circumcision cannot rightly be applyed to all the Sacraments, yet whatsoever of perfection, was in Circumcision, is also found in Baptisme, which is so full against your affirmation confirmed with your ten Reasons, pag. 116. That all the Sacraments of the Jews are abroga-

ted, circumstance, and substance, in whole, and in part. Is Circumcision of the heart abrogated? Is all spirituall meat and drink in Sacraments abrogated? Is Christ himself abrogated? This is the substance of their Sacraments, Mr. *Rutherford* (what opinion soever you heare of him yet) is well able to cleere himself from the imputation of an Arminian, He sayth, *God hath given the seal of grace upon condition that we will make use of it in faith, else the Sacrament is blank and null: Due rights of Presbyteries pag. 214.* The conditionall seal of the Sacraments (according to Doctor *Ames* and Mr. *Rutherford*) is made absolute by one putting in the condition of believing, and this I take to be the meaning of the *Directory*, where direction is given to pray to this purpose, *Make this Baptisme to the Infant a seal of Adoption, Remission of sin, Regeneration, and Eternal life, and of all other promises of the covenant of grace.* A seal it is (as you rightly say) of its own nature. It is needlesse therefore to pray, and will not bear a prayer, that it may be a seal when it can be no other. The prayer then is, when it is a seal conditionall of it self, it may actually and absolutely seal those graces mentioned, to the Infant, which interpretation of the petition, that which immediatly goes before cleers that *God would joyn the inward Baptisme of his spirit with the outward Baptisme of water*, so that others besides *Arminians* (you see) have asserted this thing. You bring in your margent the testimony of Doctor *Twisse*, as speaking for you in these words, *I willingly confesse that the Sacrament of Baptisme is the seal of the righteousness of faith unto us Christians, as Circumcision was unto the Jews, Rom. 4. which is as much to say, as it assures us of the remission of our sins, as many of us as believe, and I conceive it to be a visible signe of an invisible grace, and yet not of justification onely unto them that believe, but of the grace of regeneration also, but how? Not as at that instant collata, but suo tempore conferranda.* In which words of that learned Author I observe, 1 That Baptisme and Circumcision are both one, in substance, and signification, both seals of the righteousness of faith. 2 That Circumcision did seal to the Infantes of the Jews this righteousness: so Doctor *Twisse* very well knows that they were circumcised in Infancy, and so by consequence the seal must be no other then conditionall. 3 That Baptisme assuring as many as do believe of the remission of sins, it assures all that are baptized upon condition that they do believe. A Prince sends out his pardon sealed, to all that shall submit to his clemency, This assures all upon condition of submission, actually assures when they have submitted. God sends out the like in the Word and Sacraments, to all that shall believe: This assures all on condition of faith, actually assures when they do believe. 4 That Baptisme is a seal of regeneration not yet wrought,

but in time to be conferrd, Then men unregenerate are baptized, and their regeneration being (as he sayth) in Baptisme sealed which must needs be conditionall, it cannot be absolute, unlesse it be conditionall, it seals untruths to many persons, you send us to the same Authour to see more to the same purpose, which I willingly would doe but that I have not the Booke, for if it be to the same purpose, it is nothing to your purpose. And the truth is evident in these reasons, 1 Conditionall promises must have answerable seales, but the promises required conditions. 2 Soules put into the hands of those that know not who absolutely are to be sealed, are no other then conditionall, the seales of the Sacraments are put into such hands. 3 The seale of the Sacraments and the seale of the spirit are not in an equall latitude, must not be confounded, but the seale of the spirit is that which is absolute, infalibly to distinguish every one that is sealed. 4 No outward privilege of a Church visible can absolutely assure the members of justification, regeneration, and salvation, so all the members of visible Churches should be saved, but the seales of the Sacraments are a privilege of the Church visible. 5 As is the call so is the seale of the person called, but the call of a man that is baptized is conditionall and therefore after calling, he is exhorted *to make his calling and election sure*; 2 Pet. 1. 10. And therefore I doubt not to conclude that the seales of the Sacraments are not absolute but conditionall.

§ 2. *The entrance into Covenant, and acceptation of the terms of it, is common to the elect and reprobate, a heart steadfast in the Covenant, and the mercies of the Covenant are proper onely to the elect and regenerate.*

Nor doe I know any (say you) but Corvinus and the Arminians, that do speak of the covenant of grace, as if it were, common to the elect and reprobates, and conditionall in this sense, as if God left it to mens liberty to whom hee had sealed, to agnize or receive that sealing, or to free themselves, if they please, and so nullifie all, yet so as to afford them awhile, the favour and privilege of being in covenant with him. I appeal (say you) to them who have been conversant in the Writings of Arminians, whether these speeches do not symbolize with their language. So far as concerns the seales we have spoken already, now for the Covenant whether common to the elect and reprobate, or whether onely proper to the elect is to be considered. Its for testimonies seeing you say onely Arminians so speak, *Paras.* did passe for no Arminian in the Synod of Dort, when



when they in their Letters desired his judgement (being by age and weaknesse not able to travell to them) in the controverted points, and having obtained it, they did insert it, in their *Acta Synodalia*, Falling sick unto death, three yeers after, in his last Will (published by *Philip Paracelsus* his son) he professed his detestation of that way, of freedom of will by name: Now *Step'ten* urging your very argument against Covenant holinesse, or rather you urging his, *Multis Israelitarum fuerunt reprobi, &c.* Many of the Israelites were reprobates, and all the infants of Christians are not elected, as experience shews when they come to growth, but *reprobates* are in covenant with God. Therefore all the infants of Christians are not in covenant with God. To this *Paracelsus* answers in *1 Cor. 7. 14.* *Essi in fœdere dicitur dupliciter, &c.* To be in covenant is taken two ways, eyther according to the right, or according to the benefits of the covenant. He is in covenant, eyther that attains to the benefits of the covenant, as remission of sins, Adoption, Regeneration, Salvation, or else that obtains onely the right, and outward signe of the covenant. The *Minor proposition* (sayth hee) is true onely of the benefits of the covenant, which heretofore did, and now doe onely belong to the elect. But as to the right and outward signe of the covenant, it is denyed, for that indifferently belongs to all that are born in the Church, among whom the event makes it appeare that there are many reprobates, Neyther is it lawfull for the Church to exclude any but those that exclude themselves by their manifest impiety (which heretofore the Israelites did, and many apostatizing Christians now do, to their greater condemnation) whether they embrace the benefits of the covenant by a lively faith, or whether they can in hypocrisy, *Master Ball* in his *Treatise of the Covenant*, pag. 24. Externally this covenant is made with every member of the Church, even with the parents and their children, so many as heare and embrace the promises of salvation, and give and dedicate their children to God according to his direction, for the Sacraments what are they but seals of the covenant? But savingly, effectually, and in speciall manner, it is made onely with them, who are partakers of the benefits promised. And as the covenant is made outwardly, or effectually, so some are the people of God externally, others indeed and in truth, for they are the people of God with whom God hath contracted a covenant, and who in like manner have sworn to the words of the Covenant. God stipulating, and the people receiving the condition, which is done two ways: so eyther the covenant is made extrinsically, God by some speciall token gathering the people, and the people embracing the condition in the same manner, and so an externall consociation of God and the people is made, or the covenant is entered after an invisible manner, by the intervention of the spirit, and that with so great efficacy, that the condution of the cove-

nant is received, after an invisible manner, and so an internall consociation of God and the people is made up. pag. 91. of the same Treatise wee have these words, It appears then that all are not in covenant after one manner, nor do all that be in covenant equally partake of the same blessings, They that be outwardly in covenant partake the outward and basest part of the covenant, They that be truly in covenant, obtaine the highest, But what blessings soever they enjoy, they are given according to the covenant of grace, and not of works, pag. 154. we have these words Two things are to be considered in the covenant. 1 The persons in covenant according to the externall administration, or according to the effectuall purpose, and internall administration. 2 The good things promised, not onely temporall, but spirituell. To the first sort, the promises of the covenant are made sincerely, but conditionally. If they do well they shall be accepted, &c. To the other being effectually called, all other promises are made absolutely, or at least shall be absolutely made good because God will give them to do what he requireth. Having produced some testimonies upon occasion of your challenge of all to be on your party in this matter of the Covenant, & seals annexed, except Arminians, let us look into the thing it selfe, I mean the extent of the Covenant, whether it be in every respect proper to the elect, or whether it be common in any respect to the elect and reprobate. Now that this may be done so as to give the reader satisfaction divers things are to be considered. 1 What a Covenant is, what is the generall nature of it, and here we must distinguish of the severall acceptations of it. The proper acceptation must be distinguished from that which is topicall and figurative. A Covenant properly taken is an agreement of two parties upon conditions to be performed by both: A covenant properly so called, is not of one, but between two parties, Micah makes an offer to a wandering Levite, *Judg. 17. 10. Dwell with me, and be to me a father, and a Priest, and I will give thee ten shekels of silver by the year, and a sheaf of apprell, and thy victuals.* Here is a promise or tender, but without the Levites consent, it is no Covenant, for the next words, the Levite consented, went in, and was contented, here the agreement is made, now it is a Covenant in a figurative and topicall acceptation, sometimes the promise tendered and offered, is called a Covenant. And so Micah his offer to the Levite might be called his Covenant being his part of it in case accepted, and so Gods tender of himselfe to his people, is called his Covenant, *Gen. 17. 7. 9. I will establish my Covenant, between me and thy seed after thee, in their generations for an everlasting Covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.* Sometimes the stipulation or performance of what is due upon acceptation is called a Covenant; so the Priests discharge of his office in the way agreed

agreed upon, might be called his Covenant, being his part of the Covenant, So *Psal. 50. 5. Yee that have made a Covenant with me by Sacrifice*, when Sacrifice was not the Covenant, but the homage due from a people in Covenant, sometimes the seal or evidence is called a Covenant, and so the evidence of purchase between *Hananiel* and *Jeremy*, *Jer. 32. 10.* might be called their Covenant, so *Gen. 17. 10 11.* Circumcision is called the Covenant.

2 Gods way of entering Covenant with men is to be considered, in which we will not look back to the Covenant entered with *Abraham* the first hint of which we have, *Gen. 12. 1, 2 3.* as well Gods promise as *Abrahams* acceptance, which Covenant continued with *Abraham* and his seed, and those that should joyne themselves to him, till the time of a further enlargement. The way of entrance into Covenant in Gospel times is that which wee look after, in which I shall lay down these positions.

1. God works not a people into Covenant in an immediate way; no Nation, or very rarely any man in a Nation, was ever brought into Covenant that way, as (for ought appears) *Abraham* was by Gods immediate voice, vision, dream, or the like.

2. He hath appointed and set apart some out of mankind whom hee gifts and employes in this work to call men into covenant. As he took not the seed of Angels, so he employes not the ministry of Angels, he took the seed of man to save mankind, and he useth the ministry of man, *When he ascended on high he gave gifts to men, Minera, foundations, offices to this purpose.*

3. All Nations and persons in the world are eligible into this Covenant. It is not as it was proper to some, that it may not be tendered to others, but as there are promises, *That the Kingdom of the world shall become the Kingdom of the Lord and of his Christ, Revel. 11. 15.* That the uttermost parts of the earth shall be his possession. *Psal. 28.* his in covenant, as *Abraham* and his posterity once were, so it must be tendered to all, therefore the commission is, *Goe teach all Nations, Disciple all, Covenant all, all Disciples are Covenanters*, so that all Nations now are in a better case then any Nation (except the Jews) were in time of the Law, though the tender of the Covenant is not happily actually brought them, yet it is not forbidden them.

4. Christ himselfe hath laid down the termes of the Covenant, and those are contained in the Gospel Prophecies, *Mar. 16. 16. Goe preach the Gospel to every creature*, tender to them my Covenant of salvation: That is the work of Gods Ministers to make known Gods tender and



and offer of salvation. The restipulation or condition required is faith, the seale is baptism, *Hee that be'ieveth and is baptized shall bee saved.* So that the Gospel may be preached as it was at *Antioch*, to those that reject it, *and iudge themselves unworthy of eternall life. Act. 13. 46.* and so no Covenant struck. But where the Gospel is both tendered and accepted, there is a Covenant made.

3 We must distinguish between the essence of a Covenant, and the words of it. The essence is in the consent of both parties, the words are onely a declaration or manifestation of it, as the written instrument is not a mans will but a means of the notification or publication of it.

4 We must distinguish between the making or entring into covenant, and the stedfast upright walking, and sincere keeping of it, The very entrance denominates a man in covenant, gives men that title of relation to God, men call such the people of God, God calls them such, and they call themselves such, the Scripture phrase is a people *in whom Gods name is called*, they disclaime other Gods, and professe alone his worship. But it is the stedfast walking, and sincere observance of the covenant that obtains the mercy promised, The privileges indured. This distinction is plainly gathered from *Jeremy 31. 33.* There is a Covenant mentioned, which God made with his people, when hee brought them out of the land of Egypt, *which my Covenant they brake* (saith the Lord) *though I was a husband to them.* It was therefore a Covenant of grace, and a Covenant also mentioned in the words that follow, which is made and kept, and the mercies obtained, *I will forgive their iniquity, and remember their sins no more*, Now to bring that home to our present purpose, the Covenant made (according as in the Gospel way we see it laid down) is common to the elect and reprobate, the reprobate remember that *God is their rock*, and the high God their redeemer, when *their heart is not right with him*, ver: 2. then *are they stedfast in his Covenant*, *Psalm 78. 37.* *Hymeneus and Alexander* making shipwreck of faith, brake the Covenant that they had entered, *1 Tim. 1. 19.* as also those widdows that *have damnation, because they cast off their first faith*, *1 Tim. 5. 12.* The Covenant kept is proper to the elect and regenerate.

Ob. But some may say, the Covenant in the dayes of the Gospel, is always kept by those that are in Covenant, and the mercies of the Covenant attained, it is no Covenant if broke: *This is the Covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, I will put my Law into their inward parts, and write it in their hearts &c.* This is opposed to the Covenant that was broken, this Covenant then shall ever be kept, which in Gospel times is the Covenant: Answer, if

we take the words exactly, as in the letter of the Prophecie they run, then all ministry is beaten down, and all mutuall edification ceases. There follows *They shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know ye the Lord, for they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest of them.* God is then to doe all, we are to act nothing, either to gain knowledge our selves, or work it in others, nay, there is not so much as faith there required for the pardon of sin, men in unbelief may have their sins forgiven, But Scripture Prophecies must not be so understood as to thwart the history, the Gospel narration of fulfilling of them, there we see God entering Covenant, and bringing men into Covenant by mens ministry, we see faith then required by way of stipulation for the forgiveness of sin, There we finde a teaching and a teaching, a call and a call, a faith and a faith, a Church and a Church, a seale and a seale, there must then necessarily be a Covenant and a Covenant, when reprobates have knowledge even to make boast of the Law, to preach to others, *Mat. 7. 22, 23.* are called by the Gospel, *Mat. 23. 14.* doe believe, *Luke 8. 13.* *1 Tim. 1. 19.* make up, with others the Church, *2 Tim. 2. 20.* *Mat. 13. 47.* have the scales of the Sacraments, *Act. 8. 13.* how are they not in Covenant? An outward teaching, an outward calling, barely by mens ministry, a faith meerly dogmaticall or historicall, a number no bigger then a Church visible, a seale externall must needs have a covenant answerable, If a man instructed in the Gospel, called believing or a Church member sealed, may perish, then a man in Covenant may perish, that is, he may be so in Covenant that he may perish, every call of God must needs be a removall from the State in which a man was before calling, unto a nearer relation to God, faith necessarily implies an acceptation of God for our God: Every Church is made up of a people separated for God from others that are aliens from him: Men sealed with the seale of God, appertain to him, all this implies no lesse then a Covenant, all of these then are in covenant, reprobates are with others in Covenant, but the difficulty yet lies, what is meant by this Covenant, *A new Covenant will I make, &c.* which is set as we see, in opposition to that which was broken. For the clearing of which we may observe, that as Christ gives a new Commandement, *John 13. 34.* So by the Prophet he promises or foretels a New Covenant: The new Commandement there is a new discovery of the right meaning of the same Commandement that they had before. The same Commandement which Christ calls new, was from the beginning, the same command which *Cain* transgressed, but it was as it were buried and absented in a Law of Ceremonies, those in-  
 ferious precepts had so overtopped this, that it seemed wholly laid by and neg-  
 lected

lected, and therefore when a Scribe could say to our Saviour, *There is one God, and there is no other then he, and to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soule, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbour as himselfe is more then all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices*, Mat. 22. 37. our Saviour tels him that he had answered discretely, and that he was not far from the Kingdom of God. Few did attain to so right a meaning of that commandment, so this new Covenant is a new and further clearing of the right meaning of the Covenant that they formerly had, and the right way to obtain the benefits of it: This Covenant of *Jeremi* is no more then that promise, *Deut. 30. 6. The Lord thy God will circumcise thy heart, and the heart of thy seed, that thou maist love the Lord, &c.* But what that circumcision of heart there spoken of by *Moses* is, or what way it is wrought, is not so cleere in *Moses*, nor yet (without further light) in any of the Prophets. This Covenant is not then here new, but new cleared and interpreted, there was never more Covenants then one made since *Adams* fall, many have beene the degrees of light, in which it hath appeared, but still it is one in kinde and substance. *Camero* indeed makes three Covenants, one of nature, one of grace, and one subservient to that of grace, *Thef. 7.* But *Ubi unum propter aliud ibi unum tantum. Two, one subservient to, another, are but one.* These two Covenants the old and the new, one serves for, and is subordinate, to the other, and therefore they are still but one, yet the former of these was not without fault, but this latter perfects and fulfils, not that any thing was wrong in that former Covenant (as *Master Dixon* on *Heb. 8. 7.* hath well observed) But it was imperfect, and all things in it were not expressed cleerly. The New is without fault, in that it is perfect and all cleerly laid open. In this new Covenant two things are cleared; First, the duty or restitution required: This in the Old Testament by way of command was written in the Law, they that were under it were apt to look into *Moses*, to harken to those that preached *Moses*, *Act. 15.* To rest upon mans teaching for to know it, they were apt to strive with their own indeavours, and rest in their own strength to doe it, so the Law was a killing letter, *2 Cor. 3. 6.* working wrath, requiring of men in the Covenant of grace what in no measure they had abilities to doe, now this is put into a promise, God will teach them, God will strengthen them, what he wrote in stone he will write in their hearts, that they may know it, and have strength to obey it, resting on mens Ministry in the former, this now raises above man for light, resting on their own endeavour in the former, this raises them higher to looke after another helper, yet in this new Covenant mans teaching is not excluded, The mediator of the Co-



venant (as we have heard) hath established it, but the right use of it, as an instrument of the spirit is expiated, *God hath made us* (saith the Apostle) *able Ministers of the New Testament, not of the letter, but of the spirit.* 2 Cor. 3.6. neither are we exempted from obedience, *He that nameth Christ*, as a person in Covenant, *must depart from iniquity.* 2 Tim. 2.19 And those that work iniquity what clayme soever it is that they lay to Christ, are cast off by him, *Mat. 7.23.* This is not in that manner Gods work, but it also implies our duty, which the Gospel expressly calls for, it requires our whole knowledge of the wayes of God, delight in them, and obedience of them, and promises exclude not, but call for endeavours, compare *Deut. 30.6.* and *Deut. 10.16.* *Ezek. 30.26.* and *Ezek. 18.31.* *Ezek. 36.25.* and *Esay 1.16.* It is true that the first habit is infused, and the worker set on foot by God himselſe, we can not move till we be moyed, we cannot rise from our dead condition till quickned. But the first habit by us is actuated, and the worke carried on by us through divine assistance, *Lazarus* quickned by the word, and divine power of Christ doth rise, we being quickned also rise, *through faith of the operation of God,* Col. 2.12. Faith is our act, but it takes power from God for assistance, God then so writes, that it is stil our work, *that the word may dwell in us plentifully in all wisdom,* Coll. 3.16. But why is there then (may some say) in this prophesie of the new covenant, all promises and priviledges, and not so much as a syllable of duty and obedience? All here is on Gods part, and nothing of ours, by way of restitution, to carry our selves as a people in Covenant? I answer, the Apostle doth not here set out the whole mixture of the Covenant, but corrects former faults, rectifies former mistakes, expresses fully what formerly had been but little known, and in a generall way neglected. The Prophet *Isai. 58.* finding fault with *Israels* fasts, sayth, *Is not this the fast that I have chosen, to loose the bands of wickednesse, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free? and that ye break every yoke? Is it not to deal the bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house? When thou seest the naked, that thou cover him, and that thou hide not thy self from thine own flesh.* In which words none will say that the Prophet sets out the whole nature of a religious Fast, but onely calls for that which was generally neglected, of *Israel* when they fasted. So the Prophet *Jeremy* here, doth not set out the whole nature of a Gospel Covenant (as appears in the whole tenour of the Gospell, as published by Christ and his Apostles) but supplies the defects of the former Covenant, fully discovers that which in the old way of dispensation was little known, and very little looked after. The second thing, here cleared, is the priviledge or mercy expected, which is the

the free forgiveness of sin. Sin held them in a continuall doubtfull anxiety of minde, and to this end they were continually exercised, in the sacrifices of Bulls and Goats, which the Apostle sayth, could never take away sin, now here is a gracious promise, (shadowed out in those types) of a free taking away of sin, The prophesie tells us of the mercy, the Scriptures of the new Testament make cleere the meanes or price of purchase, the blood of Christ, which is Gods gift, and Christs work in that manner that one faith must yet accept it, *Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood*, Rom. 3. 28. *By him all that believe are justified, from all things, from which they could not be justified by the Law of Moses*, Acts 13. 39. By all which that hath been spoken, it plainly appeares that nothing in this text of *Jeremies* doth contradict what hath been spoken before of the nature of a Covenant, of the Gospell Covenant in particular, of the extent of his Covenant of grace, All have entred Covenant that professe Christ, and beare his name, they are properly said to be in covenant, the condition of the Covenant or restipulation is carried on, onely in and by the elect, through the power of free grace to salvation.

§ 3 *To say that the Seals of the Sacraments are conditionall, and that the reprobate are within the verge of the Covenant, as rendered in the Gospell, and accepted is not to symbolize with Arminians.*

In your words before recited, in the beginning of the last Section you doe doe plainly enough signifie that you take for granted that Master *Marshall* holds, that when God hath brought a man so far as to a profession of Christ, and to an externall seale, he then leaves him at liberty, to the freedome of his own will, for any further walking in the Covenant, or restipulation required. This is his sense, if it be (as you say) the Arminians sense, and symbolises with them. If Master *Marshall* hath uttered any such thing, or that which by necessary consequence imports any such position, I shall take it for his error, but in case he be in this point orthodox, others will take it for your slander. Arminians say, that God cannot require conditions of men in covenant, and himselfe promise, and irresistibly work them, *vide Diss. 47*. This Master *Marshall* I think hath not said, but this we may say, that God may require a condition, and man assent to it, and make a promise of it, and so make up a Covenant between God and himselfe, and yet God may justly refuse to carry it,

It on, making the stipulation covenanted, where he please to salvation; and where he please refusing, there is no absolute promise, nor yet actuall carrying on of the worke in that latitude, as the scales and acceptation of the terms of the Covenant doe reach, an ill glosse may make a true position pure Arminianism, this proposition, *That it is Gods pleasure to give everlasting life to all that doe believe*, is such that I suppose you will not deny, they are our Saviours own words, *John 6. 40.* yet those that will interpret this of the decree of God, looking onely at qualties, not at persons, leaving to mens power to believe or not believe, then even this proposition sent in this manner is justly rejected as putting the discrimination or differencing work on mans free will, not on Gods free grace. Putting a greater latitude upon the termes of the Covenant, entered on both parties, then we doe upon the performance or restitution of the person in Covenant, we attribute nothing to freedom of will, nor yet detract at all from the work of grace, which in case we did, we did too well symbolize, with many of your opinion. In your handling of this controversy you strike in with Independents, both you and they (though neither professe it) taking that way to the overthrow of all visible Churches, allowing no interest in a Church visible, unlesse the same person have title also to the invisible body, they speake not of *believers, called ones, Saints* respective to ordinances, and in Church relation: But they meane the elect, regenerate, though they can not deny that Scripture language is otherwise, he hath these titles of honour in Scripture that is removed from an infidel to the profession of Christ. When they define a visible Church, the definition is such, that is proper onely to the Church invisible, as may be seen in Master Cottons Catechisme, you admit no other to be in covenant save the elect, when every Church is in covenant, every Church member is in covenant, first, with God, secondly, with his people, where in the world soever, and so a visible Church shall consist onely of elect, regenerate, invisible members, and no others, you have closed with the Jesuites in opposition of covenant holinesse, fighting with their weapons, now you are gone into an extreme over much distant from them, they will have no such thing as a Church invisible, and you will have none but that which is invisible. All whom you throw out of Covenant with God you must dischurch, and you throw out all that are not elected. *Amesius* whom I have heard challenged to be that way, is herein far from your minde concerning the Covenant, or either theirs or yours concerning visible Churches, he thus speaks of visible Churches, *Ratione fidei, quam profitemur, recte dicuntur esse in Deo patre, & in Domino Jesu Christo.* By reason of the faith which they professe, they are rightly said to be in God the Father, and



and in our Lord Jesus Christ, quoting, 1 *Thes.* 1. 1. *Medul. Lib.* 1. *Cap.* 32. *Sect.* 9. Such cannot be denied to be in Covenant with God, yet in the next words he saith, *Maxime etiam probabile est nullum dari Ecclesiam istiusmodi particularem, in qua vera fides professio, et quin in eadem etiam reperiantur nonnulli vere fideles.* It is also most probable, that there is no particular Church of this kinde, where there is a true profession of faith: But there are some that are true believers to be found; he will not say, but Churches may be made up in covenant, where there is not any regenerate, though he believes it more probable, that in all such Churches, some are truly in the faith: What shall we then say of the other some which are the greatest number, of whom he hath not hopes so much as probable, of any such invisible grace.

## CHAP. XVI.

*The comforts of Christian parents in their issue is much eclipsed, when they are cast out of covenant, and their right to the initiating Sacrament of Baptisme is denied.*

**P**Ag 170. You fall upon a passage in Master Marshall's application, charging Anabaptists (as you say) with a rash and bloody sentence condemning infants, as out of the state of grace, and then tragically aggravating the thing, &c. To which you reply, Till you produce some testimonies of those you call Anabaptists, determining, I shall take it, but for a false accusation, and a fruit of passion, not of holy zeal, Master Marshall puts this not upon any Author in particular, but only makes it a consequent of the opinion in generall, and for a testimony he needs to look no further then the top of your leaf where you say, *Inf. nt Baptisme is a corruption of the Ordinance of Baptisme*, If Infants be not only held from baptism, but their baptism is also a corruption of that Ordinance, and there is no such thing, as covenant holinesse to give them any title or interest, then they are out of covenant, strangers to the promises of God, and so the doom, *Ephes.* 2. 12. lyes heavy upon them, you refer to *Part.* 2. *Sect.* 10. for the clearing of this, and I refer to *cap.* 2. *Sect.* 2. for answer, *pag.* 109. you are upon the same thing, *As for cutting off a great part of the comforts of believing parents, I pray you tell us what comforts cut off by it, you cannot say that an infant is certainly regenerated and saved by baptism, nor can you say he is lost for want of it.* Thus after your manner you mistake, though

though I believe you do not mistake the question, we say not that an Infant is lost for want of baptisme, but we say that all infants and men of yeers for ought that we can finde from any Scripture grounds are utterly lost, that want all right of baptisme, I know they must stand or fall to their own Master, but (as one said well of the heathens, so may we say of infants that) they fall and doe not stand, if Christ be not their Master, and you have spoken reasonably sufficient to take them off from all such interest, in case you did onely forbear their baptisme, and not deny their right, you did undeservedly beare that censure, but when they are not baptized, and all right to baptisme, and share in the Covenant denyed them, they are then left in the case of the heathen, without God, without hope, The visible Church is the City, whose name is, *The Lord is there*, Ezek. 48. 35. and neither age nor youth by him is excluded out of the compasse of this place. we know not that he receiveth any, the Scripture speaks of such as are strangers to it in a hard language. I shall conclude with a speech of his whom you deservedly commend, Master Ball on the Covenant, *Pag. 92. We will not use the grace of God to ourward means, but ordinarily we cannot affirme they pertain to the Covenant of grace, and obtain the highest blessings promised them, whom God doth not count safe so much as outwardly to receive into Covenant.*

## C H A P. XVII.

## The Conclusion of the whole.

SIR,

**Y**OU here see that I have followed your advise, and have revised my Treatise, not to that end (which you suggest) to examine whether, it, or any passages in it, answer to Master Vines, and others commendation of it. I very well know that nothing that is mine, can be worthy of it. Nor yet to try whether all your contumelious censures are deservedly put upon it, being such as do not adde to your repute, and I am confident will not detract from mine. But to see whether the truth of God will beare me out, in what I have said, resolving, praying, that I may be of those, that can do nothing against  
but

but for the truth. I well know that I must answer what I speak, much more what I preach, delivering it as a message from God, Most of all what in this kinde I write, as being like to do most good, if good, most evill, if evill. And I here protest I have not found with all the helpe of your quick sight, one passage (by you excepted against) that with peace of conscience I dare retract, or call back, nor one interpretation which you have questioned, which I doe not believe is the genuine meaning. And as I have satisfied my self, so I have endevoured to give the Reader satisfaction, in which, I suppose, that none will say that I have run out, into any needlesse discourses, or personall invectives, or that I have not truly put the question in controversie, looking onely at truth, and not advantage, wishing that all your reasons should appeare in their strength, wishing that if any more strength were behinde, that I did know it. Eytber it is the truth, or else the truth will answer it, I have studied, when I have quoted your words, to let the Reader understand upon what occasion you bring them, that so he may best judge of them, not willingly altering a word, but where the manner of inference sometimes doth necessitate it, And then I have been tender, not in the least measure to go from the known meaning, I am at too great a distance, to hearken to your motion, to joyne with others that have appeared in publike in reply to your Examen. And in all our meetings, while I remayned in London, you never did me the favour as to signifie that you had wrote, much lesse that you intended to publish, any thing that so much concerned me. Neither did I ever see it, whiles it was in Manuscript, (as perhaps might be conjectured) nor once heare that it was made publike, till it came to my hands by means of a worthy member of the House of Commons, with this note upon it, of an insulting Authour: I pray you let mee take leave, to make some motions to you, as you have done to others. When you deal with an adversary, and will make your selfe an opposite, give him leave to lay down his own opinions, and to use his own expressions, each man best knows his own minde, and is the best interpreter of his own meaning; Jacob thought it a great aggravation of Labans ill dealings, to change his wages ten times; you have as  
often



often palpably changed my words, or at least found out words, and opinions, that I never uttered, as the Reader may see, pag. 40, pag. 53, pag. 77, pag. 128, pag. 130, three severall times, In all which places you bring words (in a distinct character) as mine, which I disclaime, pag. 78, pag. 104, pag. 134, Those things are charged upon me (though not as the other in a Character distinct) which never were my thoughts, much lesse my words. The perticulars along have been noted, other things which you charge, not in so direct away I passe over. 2 Let not your adversary go away with whoops and jeers, with some Poeticall flashes, instead of a rationall answer, your Reader may soon see that your adversary severall times can finde nothing more. 3 Do not offend against your own rule, when you endeavour an answer to premise some odious censure. which whether it can tend, or to what purpose it is done, but to work prejudice in your Readers thoughts, I leave to your selfe to consider. 4 If you persist in your opinion, that Covenant holinesse is such an error, let us have some arguments against it for our conviction and satisfaction which we have not had over and over from Jesuites and their adherents, long since answered by Protestant writers, and if you thinke (as you professe) that this would add to the glory of a Reformation: Let not these Emissaries of Antichrist (whom I hope you doe not intend to honour) have the glory of it. 5 When you enter the lists of a dispute state aright the question, and keepe close to it when it is stated, which how seldome you have done hath been in this Answer discovered. 6 Give other men leave to judge of the conquest, whether they or you have the victory, as believing that others may see somewhat, and not you all, yea, that your selfe are likest in your own cause to be partiall. And that you may know that I am not alone in observation of your writing, or that I speake as brassed with selfe reflections. These words following I saw in a letter of a learned acquaintance of years (whose face yet for some years you have not seen) expressing his thoughts of your book--- His wild, extravagant exceptions, his insolent censuring of others, his partiall citation of others words, his conspiring with Jesuites in the interpretation of some Texts,

Q and

and which is worst of all, his grosse mistake of the state of the question. But above all, my request is, that you would employ your learned gifts on a more necessary subject, and bend your studies against those, which are (in your own judgement) errors, of an higher nature then this in controversie, that so our divisions may not be widened when they should be closed: Remember what you say, (Pag. 31.) you look on, As one of the greatest plagues of Christianity, so you cannot I believe judge of this, though you have spoken much in dislike, yet your censures are not raised so high, help us then in this cure: That the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments, and other acts of communion publike and private, be not neglected and despised: You are a man whom for many years I have honoured, when you are not ignorant that others censured, in so much that when you discovered a scruple in this thing and desired secrecy, I held it as a Piaculum to disclose it, fearing that it might turn to your prejudice: My carriage was such that your own mouth cleared me when you had others in suspicion of more unkind dealing, and you did professe both after our conference, and the publishing of that little Treatise, that you loved me as much as ever, and revered me, what I have now done conscience of truth hath enforced, unwilling to be so easily cast out of possession in so just and honourable a cause, in which the Churches prescription (I believe) is as ancient as Master Marshall hath asserted. My present weaknesses and many distractions may take off all suspicion of desire to be further busied in such contentions. If we must differ, let it be with Christian moderation, forbearing such language as will never honour the cause, nor be usefull for discovery of the truth. This is the desire of

Your well wishing, though despised  
brother, and fellow labourer,

Thomas Blake.



*This is to certifie to all those whom  
it may Concern, Published*

*By Mr. S. Parker. 7 Aug: 1646*

**T**hat whereas by divers Traders there are many Bibles dispersed abroad by sundry Chapmen into all parts, which Books many of them be false Printed, and very many deceitfully bound beyond the seas in Sheeps leather, and some gilded with Party-gold, whereby the buyers being ignorant are much deceived, and not onely so cozened of their money, but the books are also forfeited and they lyable to the Law; this is to give notice,

That by provision of a Statute in Vicesimo Quinto Henrici Octavi, it was Enacted, That no person or persons Resciant or Inhabitant within this Realm, shall buy to sell again any Printed books brought from any parts out of the Kings Obeisance, ready Bound in Bords, Leather, or Parchment, upon pain to lose and forfeit for every such book Bound out of the said Kings Obeysance, and brought into this Realm, and bought by any person or persons within the same, to sell again, contrary to this Act, six shillings and eight pence.